Gl 6252

A VINDICATION OF THE *Primitive Fathers*

against the Imputations of

GILBERT Lord Bishop OF *SARUM*,

In his Discourse on the Divinity and Death of Christ, referred to the Sense and Judgment of the Church Universal, the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of the Church of *England*, the two famous Universities of *Oxon* and *Cambridge*, and the next Session of the Convocation, by

Samuel Hill Rector of *Killmington* in the Diocese of *Bath* and *Wells*.

Athan. de *Synod Arimin.* & *Seleuc.* Δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς καὶ πρέπει τοιαῦτα φρονεῖν, τοιαύτην τε σώζειν ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας, εἴγε μὴ νόθοι τυγχάνομεν, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔχομεν τὰς παραδόσεις, καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλίαν.

Printed for *J. Whitlock* near *Stationers-hall*. 1695.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

THat there was just Cause for a Writing of this nature, I hope this Book it self will convince even his Lordship himself; but how I came to be engaged in it, perhaps

the Curious may desire to know, and I think it reasonable enough to satisfie them.

His Lordship had been well assured by some of his most Dutiful Clergy, that the integrity of his Faith was under a common suspicion, for causes which I shall think fit to suppress. And this did so sensibly affect him, that thenceforward all his Advices and Discourses seem'd pointed against Deism *and* Socinianism, *to work off the Jealousie of his Clergy. And truly this seemed to be, not only a designed,*

ſigned, but an effectual Eſſay hereunto, which he offered in the Oral Diſcourſe on the Divinity and Death of Chriſt, of which I my ſelf was an Auditor at Warminſter *in the Year* 1693, *being led thither by a ſtrong deſire to know the Senſes of ſo great a Prelate, on thoſe Points which have employ'd my Theories for above Twenty Seven Years.*

And truly, as it was then delivered, it gave a general Joy and Satisfaction to the whole Corona of the Clergy, and to my

ſelf alſo; for though there were ſome little failures, I attributed thoſe to the inevitable looſeneſs of a preſent effuſion, ſince all the ſubſtance ſeemed even heartily Orthodox and Chriſtian, without any indecencies toward the Fathers, or flouts at the received Notions or Forms; and with moſt paſſionate concern againſt the Socinian *Impieties. For though, indeed, he commended the Foreign* Socinians *for their Morals, yet ours he ſeverely condemned for a rout of profligate and irreligious Villains. Inſomuch, that I not only ſincere-*

ly

ly thanked his Lordſhip, but deſired a worthy Favourite of his Lordſhip's to beſpeak the Publication, that the whole Church might rejoyce with us together, that ſo Great and Learned a Father had ſo publickly and ſolidly aſſerted that Faith, which he was ſuppoſed really to deſpiſe. And not only ſo, but I every where celebrated his Integrity and Learning among my Friends, that upon my account they quitted their prejudices againſt him, which ſeveral other Mens fair Character had not been able to remove.

But

*But when I ſaw the Diſcourſe as it came new dreſſed from the Preſs, I was quite confounded by a complication of paſſions and amazements at the Changes made in it, eſpecially by the unfriendly uſage of the Fathers, * and the gaudy Character of the* Socinian *Probity, Juſtice, and Charity. Being thus diſappointed, no wonder if my heart was heated within me. And hereupon I undertook to write to his Lordſhip my grief at thoſe Paſſages which offended me, and another particular practice of his*

* Preface to the Clergy.

his Lordſhip not to be mentioned here. This Letter his Lordſhip reſented very grievouſly as too free and daring, and for that Cauſe wrote to me, that he would admit of no diſcuſſion of particulars with a Man of my ill temper, who ſeemed made to exerciſe the patience of better Men. But had I come and modeſtly propoſed my exceptions, he could and would have given me ſatisfaction; but if I would to the Preſs for want of ſuch private ſatisfaction, (as I had forewarned his Lordſhip) I might take my Courſe, ſo that

this

this Book comes out even with his Lordſhip's Licenſe.

The Perſons near me, to whom the Letter was ſhown by his Lordſhip, on the account thereof given at ſecond hand, did indeed judge the Letter *bitter, and ſo I confeſs it was, not from any malignity in my temper, but in the matters charged on his* Lordſhip. *And to ſhew my tenderneſs of his Honour, I did proteſt to him, that I wrote it not with that Envy, through which ſome Men (forgetting his great merits) inſult on his failures,*

but

but that he might make ſuch amendments himſelf as might prevent thoſe aſſaults and cenſures, which otherwiſe muſt fall upon him. And to let him ſee, that it was written for Conſcience only, not for clamour, I promiſed him to impart it to no Man living, nor ſhould any Perſon have ever known the leaſt apex of it, if his Lordſhip himſelf had not diſcovered it. Now whether his Lordſhip be indeed able to give me ſatisfaction as to the matters taxed in his Diſcourſe, I leave to him to try, and God and his Church to judge.

But

But for the private practice I objected to him, I will at present spare him; and if his Lordship will be so kind to himself, as πᾶσαν συγχέαι ἄδικον διασπᾶν, *the matter shall not only be hushed up, but every soul of his Clergy will love him with new fervours.*

But as to his Doctrine it is gone abroad and cannot return. And if it be of evil influence on Young Students, or Men prepared to Irreligion, or of dishonourable Reflexion to the present Reign, or State of Religion,

every

every Man has a juſt right fairly and bravely to oppoſe it, without fear of Men, or reſpect of Perſons; And if it be not ſo, I promiſe his Lordſhip *the moſt publick Penance and Recantation.*

A Vindication

A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers againſt the Imputations of Gilbert, *Lord Biſhop of* Sarum, *&c.*

PART I.

§. 1. TWO Things I have to urge againſt my Lord Biſhop of *Sarum*, in his Diſcourſe on the Divinity and Death of Chriſt: One is, that he very defectively (to ſay no worſe) ſtates our Faith and Doctrine in the Articles of the Trinity and Incarnation, tho' * he profeſſes it a Matter of the greateſt Importance for *us to have our Notions concerning theſe, right and duly ſtated*; and tho' he expoſes the Fathers under the ſame and worſe Imputations, which

* P. 25.

is the second thing that offends. For he does not uncover any real failures in any particular Ancients, but censures their very Catholick and Established Principles.

§. 2. This then is to be the first part of my Charge, That he foully states the Faith of the Divinity and Incarnation of Christ, and therein of the Holy Trinity. Of which he tell us, † there have been three Opinions, to wit, the Socinian, the Arian; and then, Thirdly, that which I would have called the Catholick and Christian Faith. Now his Lordship means, there have been these three Opinions either within, or without the Church Catholick; if within, then indeed here is an insinuation laid for the Communion with Socinians and Arians, which is a blessed Comprehension; but if his Lordship means not within the Catholick Church only, then he had been nearer the number, if he had said there have been thirty Opinions in this Matter. But tho' this be inartificial enough, (if no more) yet that which is more grievously suspicious is, that he calls the Catholick Faith, but a meer Opinion, and Perswasion of a Party. * *The third Opinion* (saith his Lordship) *is, that the Godhead by the Eternal Word, the Second*

† P. 30, 31.

* P. 31.

Second in the bleſſed Three, dwelt in, and was ſo inwardly united to the Humane Nature of Jeſus Chriſt, that by Virtue of it God and Man were truly one Perſon, as our Soul and Body make one Man. And that the Eternal Word was truly God, and as ſuch is worſhipped, and adored as the proper Object of Divine Adoration. By thoſe of this Perſwaſion the Term Perſon became applied to the Three, which the Scripture only calls by the Name of Father, Son or Word, and Holy Ghoſt, on deſign to diſcover thoſe, who thought that theſe Three were only different Names of the ſame Thing. But by Perſon is not meant ſuch a Being as we commonly underſtand by that Word, a compleat intelligent Being, but only that every one of that Bleſſed Three has a peculiar diſtinction in himſelf, by which he is truly different from the other two. So again; † *This in general is the Sum of the received Doctrine, That as there is but One God, ſo in that undivided Eſſence there are Three, that are really different from one another, and are more than three Names, or three outward Oeconomies* * [or Modes] *and that the Second of theſe was in a moſt intimate and unconceivable manner united to a perfect Man; ſo that*

† P. 32, 33.

* P. 42.

from the Humane and Divine Nature thus united, there did result the Person of Christ.

§. 3. And now perhaps some may wonder what Exceptions lie against this; but there are indeed several, and those of great Importance. *First*, That he calls it an Opinion only like that of the Socinian and Arian, while yet he intimates it to be the Doctrine of the Church. The truth is, as his Lordship has stated it, it has many meer Opinions in it; but they are such as are not in the Faith, and so ought not to have been represented as the Doctrine of the Church. But if his Lordship had taken it for the Christian Faith, either as it is, or ought to have been stated by him, he ought not to have set it out as a meer Opinion or Perswasion of a third Party. For a meer partial Opinion cannot be a Divine or Catholick Faith, whether we take Opinion for the Act or Object of Opinion. For the Act is meer Humane Conjecture without certain grounds; and objectively Opinions are Propositions that have no certain, but only probable appearance, which therefore no Man is bound in Conscience to assert, or stand by for want of certain Evidence and Authority. But Catholick Faith objectively taken consists of certain

certain Principles made certainly evident by Divine Revelation to the Holy Catholick Church, and thereupon to be relied on, and aſſerted againſt all temptations in hopes of Life Eternal. Now theſe Principles thus received were the Faith of the Univerſal Church (not the Opinion of any Party) in the beginning; and therefore the contrary Parties and Opinions ariſing ſince (of what Cut or Size ſoever) pertain not to this Holy Body, in which the Faith of the Trinity truly ſtated is as eſſential as the Faith of the Unity, and as fundamental in the Chriſtian Profeſſions. Now would it not be very Theological to ſay, That all the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apoſtles, the whole Synagogue of the *Jews*, and Church of Chriſt were ever of this Opinion, That there is one God only the Creator and Governour of all things? That the Apoſtles and all Chriſtians are of Opinion that Jeſus is the Chriſt? That it is our Opinion, That he came down and dwelt among us; died, roſe again, and aſcended into Heaven, and ſhall come to Judgment at the general Reſurrection? Juſt ſo abſurd it is to call the Catholick Faith of God's Church the Opinion or Perſwaſion of a Party. 'Tis true indeed, his Lordſhip ſometimes calls it Doctrine, but this term

is equivocal, and agrees as usually to the Opinions of the Philosophers. But what I require is, that the Catholick Doctrine be asserted as a Rule of Faith, which the Church is bound to adhere to on the certain Authority of Divine Revelation; this Revelation appearing real not only to particular Men's private Opinions, but originally committed to the Charge and Custody of the whole Church by the Apostles, and so preserved by their Successors throughout the whole diffusive Body. Whereas his Lordship only lays down this Notion, or form of Faith,

† P. 26 See Discour. 3. † That we believe points of Doctrine, *because we are perswaded, that they are revealed to us in Scripture*; which is so languid and unsafe a Rule, that it will resolve Faith into every Man's private fancies and contradictory Opinions; since each Man's Faith is his Perswasion, that what he believes for a Doctrine is revealed in Scripture. Whereas the Act of a Christian Faith believes such Doctrine to be true and fundamental in Christianity from the certain Evidence thereof in the Scriptures, acknowledged by all Churches not led by casual Perswasions, but by a primitive, perpetual, universal, and unanimous Conviction and Tradition.

The

The deviation from which Rule and Notion to private Opinions and Perſwaſions is the cauſe of all Hereſies, and by its conſequent Diviſions naturally tends to the ruine of the true Chriſtian and Catholick Faith. I will not however at preſent deſcend into that thicket of Controverſie, What Rules private Perſons are bound to in the learning and profeſſing the Chriſtian Faith; but whoſoever will arrive to a maturity of Judgment and Knowledge herein, muſt betake him † to the ex- † P. 63.
ploded Rule of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, and take that for fundamental Doctrine, which hath been received for ſuch in all Ages, Places, and Churches. A Rule very practicable and eaſie, ſince there are ſufficient Memorials of the Primitive Antiquity, delivering unto us their Creeds and Summaries of the then Catholick Faith, which from them has uniformly deſcended to all Churches of the later Ages. It is true indeed, every ſingle Man can believe no otherwiſe than he is privately perſwaded; but he that is not to be perſwaded to receive the common and eſtabliſhed Syſtems of the Faith of the Church Catholick, upon the Authority on which it hath ever ſtood, and yet ſtands, or ſhall wantonly coin our other Articles

for fundamental upon his own private Opinion, belongs not to the Communion of the Church of Christ; though he fansies his conceptions revealed in the Scriptures.

§. 4. Secondly, His Lordship is not clear in the point of Incarnation; for he tells us, *that this third Opinion is, that by the Union of the Eternal Word with Christ's Humanity, God and Man truly became one Person.* Now here first we are not taught, whether there were three, or any one Person in the God-head before the Incarnation: For this account will admit the Personality of Christ to be founded first † in the Humane Nature according to some of his Lordship's Criticks, (which he dares not contradict) who place the foundation of the Sonship in the lower Nature. Yea, this Description will admit the Patripassian Heresie of but one Person in the Deity: For if the Eternal Word were no Person distinct from the Father, the Union thereof with the Humanity constitutes the Father an incarnate Person; or otherwise by this State of his Lordships Doctrine, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost may be conceived as one incarnate Person. Whereas his Lordship well knows our Faith to be clear, That

† P. 32.

the

the Eternal Word is perſonally diſtinct, or a diſtinct Perſon from the Father, and alone aſſumed the Humanity into a Perſonal Union with himſelf, and ſo alone was the Perſon of Chriſt exceptively of the Father and the Holy Ghoſt from this Perſonality and Character.

§. 5. Now if a Man would enquire into the Motives of this affected obſcurity in his Lordſhip, that leaves open a gap to ſo many Hereſies, his Lordſhip's Words would lead one to a concluſion, or at leaſt a fair jealouſie, that his Lordſhip does not believe any Diſtinction really Perſonal between the Father, Word, and Holy Spirit, but that the true and real Perſonality of Chriſt is proper to the Humane Nature. For he teacheth us, that thoſe whom the Church calleth Perſons, the Scripture only calls by the Names of Father, Son or Word, and Holy Ghoſt. Where that artificial Word only derogates from the propriety and fitneſs of the term Perſon, as if the Scripture terms did not come up to it, nor juſtifie it. And if his Lordſhip will ſtand by the † plain intention of his Words elſewhere, he places Chriſt's Perſonality only in his Manhood in theſe words; *That Divine Perſon in whom dwelt the Eternal Word.*

† P. 45.

So

So that the Word must be different from the Person in whom it dwelt, which must be the Heresie of *Sabellius*, *Manicheus*, or *Nestorius*. In short, while he makes the Canonical term of Person to contain some notion in it not imported in the Scripture terms, he seems for that cause to censure it, for that the Scripture does not come up so far as to teach three Persons, but only Father, Son or Word, and Holy Ghost. But when he says this third Opinion is, that by the Incarnation God and Man truly became one Person, I would fain know, whether the term Person be proper for the Θεάνθρωπος, or no? If not, the Doctrine is to be blamed, that teaches him to be truly one Person, since the truth of a Character is the greatest propriety; and if it be not true, the Doctrine that teaches it is to be cashiered. But if, to avoid this, it be true, then I would fain be instructed, whether the Church does not use the term Person in the same formal intention concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, when She calls them three Persons, as She does when She calls Christ, or the Son of God incarnate a Person? For if She uses the term in the same formal intention, then if the Christ be a proper Person, so are the Father, and Holy Spirit two other Persons properly

properly and truly distinct in the sense of the Church; but if the Church has one intention in the Term, when applied to Christ as God-man, and another when applied to the Eternal Trinity, let this be made out by just Authority, and I have done.

§. 6. But the Order of his Lordship's Discourse obliges me to break off a little from this Disquisition till the next Section, where we must resume it. For he tells us, (if we will believe him) that the term Person by those of our Perswasion came to be applied to the three, to discover those who thought that these three were different names of the same thing, which were for the most part, and were generally called, Patripassians, and were expelled as Hereticks from the Church. Now wherein lay their Heresie? Why in this, That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were not three co-essential Persons really distinct, which was the Catholick Faith; instead of which they coined this pretence, That those Names had not three distinct subjects of which they were predicates or denominations, but only were three titles of God the Father, who became incarnate and suffered for us. Now hence it appears, that their Heresie consisted in the denial of what

was

was ever before received in the Church, That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were three Persons. And if so, then is his Lordship's insinuation false and injurious, that the term Person had its rise and occasion from Patripassianism, and consequently is of a later Date, that by this fraudulent Hypochronism the term, and the sense of it may be taken for not Primitive and Traditional, but a mere later and artificial invention. Now to prove what I say to be true, I am to produce authentick Testimonies. Now in the Latin World the first I ever have read of that taught Patripassianism was *Praxeas*, against whose Heresie herein *Tertullian* wrote, and charged it for denying the Eternal Word to be a * substantial and real Person, which *Tertullian* (though then a Montanist) then asserted with the Church, though his † terms and senses were sometimes very singularly odd concerning the production of the second Person. In the Eastern Church several lapsed into the like Error, the most famous of which was

* *Tert. ad Praxeam.* Non vis enim eum substantivum habere in re, per substantiæ proprietatem, ut res & persona quædam videri possit.

† *Tert. ibid.* Itaque Sophiam quoq; exaudi ut secundam Personam conditam. —Sic & Filius in suâ personâ profitetur Patrem in nomine Sophiæ. *Novatian. de Trinit.*— secundam Personam efficiens.

was *Sabellius*, from whom the Heresie was entitled *Sabellianism*, which denied what that Church also had ever asserted, That the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were three Persons; instead whereof they asserted them to be but one Person. For the truth hereof I shall recite the Words † of St. *Athanasius*, as beyond all Exception valid. From whence it appears, that the *Sabellians* asserted but one Person against that Plurality of Persons fore-acknowledged in the Church. And now I leave it to his Lordship to explain how the denial of three Persons could be Apostasie, as this Father calls it, had not the Faith of them been before expressly avowed and received? For Heresie is an opposition of true received Faith, and Apostasie must be from an antecedent Profession. So that the Doctrine of a Personal Trinity was not later than Patripassianism, but the Original Faith.

† Athan. con. Sabell. Greg. τίσιν οὖν πιστεύσομεν, — τοῖς ἐν πρόσωπον ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ τὸ πατέρα φάσκουσιν ἢ; εἰ γὰρ ἐν πρόσωπον, πῶς τὸ μὲν ἀποστέλλει, τὸ δὲ ἀποστέλλεται; προοιρῆκε γὰρ, εἰ ἐγνώκοιτέ με, καὶ τὸ πατέρα μου ἂν ἤδειτε, τὴν δυάδα τῶν προσώπων ἄντικρυς ἡμῖν ὑξηγούμενος — προστέθησι δὲ καὶ τὸ τρίτον — ὅτε μὲν οὖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγῃ τὸ Ἐγὼ, περὶ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς, Ἐκεῖνος, περὶ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἄλλος, πῶς οὐκ ἀποστασία σαφὴς ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ τρία; — ἰδὲ γὰρ δύο πρόσωπα.

Nor

Nor does his Lordſhip ſeem candid in concealing this, which was the ſubſtance of that Hereſie, while he mentions only their teaching three Names of one thing or Perſon, which was a Conſectary, or at leaſt a Colour added to their Hereſie againſt the Trinity of real Perſons. 'Tis true a Man may innocently ſay, That the term Perſon was uſed againſt Patripaſſians, while he contends for the proper truth of their Perſonality, as the Defender of Dr. *Sherlock*'s Notion of a Trinity in Unity † cites *Facundus*'s Saying, that theſe Words, Perſon and Subſiſtence were uſed by the Fathers in oppoſition to the Sabellian Hereſie; but to throw out ſuch Expreſſions with a Deſign to deny the Primitive Antiquity of this Faith of Three proper Perſons or Perſonalities, is extremely perfidious, of which this is a certain Sign, when Men avoid the uſe of theſe Terms as a Rock of Offence, as his Lordſhip appears induſtriouſly to do in his State of the Doctrine. I have not *Facundus* by me, and ſo cannot ſo well judge of the convenience of his Words: But as to the Term Hypoſtaſis or Subſiſtence, tho' it was in uſe long before Sabellianiſm, and uſed of the Perſon of the Father,

† P. 25. Ubi citatur Facund. pro defenſione trium capit. c. 1. p. 19.

Father, * *Heb.* 1. 2. yet was that use promiscuous for Essence and Subsistence long after Sabellianism; and the determinate use thereof for the distinct Persons, was later than the Sardican Council, and was indeed at last so fixed to denote their substantial Personality, or personal Subsistence against the Sabellians, who asserted the Word and Holy Spirit ἐνυπόστατα, *non-subsistent*, that is, not distinctly subsistent from the Person of the Father in the Unity of Essence; but the Term Person, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, was ever received from the beginning without any variety or ambiguity.

* Χαρακτὴρ ὑποστάσεως.

§. 7. Now that my Surmises against his Lordship's Integrity herein are well grounded, will appear from his Lordship's explanation of this Term; which tho' it be received in the third Party, yet he dares not make his own, nor allow for proper. *By Person*, saith he, *is only meant that every one of that Blessed Three has a peculiar distinction in himself, by which he is truly different from the other Two.* Here it is plain that by using the Term Three so often, without adding Person, he shuns the Word as much as he dares at present to do, and assigns a distinction which is not any way personal.

For

For it being only ſuch a diverſity that one is not the other, it will as well agree to two or three Tobaco-pipes; for theſe are truly different from each other. I would therefore ask his Lordſhip, Does the Name of Father, as diſtinct from the Son, import no more than that one is not the other, or does it import a Perſonality really Paternal? If he will grant only the former part of the disjunction, (as he grants no more in his Diſcourſe) then there really was no God the Father from Eternity till the Creation of Chriſt, which was the firſt Article of Arianiſm; nor was he, who is by all called God the Father, ever a true Perſon, which yet however all have ever acknowledged. But if he ever was a true Perſon and Father, then firſt as to him the Term is elder than Patripaſſianiſm; and I demand a good reaſon, why the Eternal Word is not as much and as true a Perſon alſo, eſpecially if he be the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father? For otherwiſe the Father and the Son will be of Dignities ſpecifically different, if one be of a perſonal, and the other of impersonal Character; tho' how a real Son can be a thing really impersonal I cannot conceive; and then he that allows no more diſtinction but only this, that one is not the other, tacitly

denying

denying the relative diſtinction between Father and the Son, doth really deny both the Father and the Son. When theſe Words were orally delivered at *Warmiſter*, I obſerved them to my ſelf, but looked on it as a ſlip only of an extemporary ſpeaking; but when I ſee it alſo after the laſt concoction delivered from the Preſs, I ſuſpect ſomewhat more than ſhould be; I am ſure the Dictate is rotten, and tacitly imports a renunciation of our Chriſtianity.

§. 8. And yet after all, ſo great is the force of Truth, that it will maintain its Evidence, even in the Tongues and Pens of its Adverſaries. For though ſome part of his Lordſhip's Doctrines denies the Perſonality, yet others unwittingly concede it. For firſt of all, when he calls the Trinity the Bleſſed Three, not daring to ſay Perſons, the Character of Bleſſed doth import a real Perſonality. For whether it be taken for μακαριότης in the ſenſe of God's eſſential Happineſs, or in the ſenſe of εὐλογητός, as the objects of our religious Praiſes; yet if the Three are either, or both ways Bleſſed, they muſt be Perſons. For among created Beings, none are internally or effectually bleſſed, but what are Perſonal; but if any Man will cavil, and ſay, that God in the Creation bleſſed

things Imperſonal, and promiſed ſuch Bleſſings alſo in the Moſaical Covenants; it is enough to reply, That theſe Bleſſed Three are uncapable of thoſe lower forms of Benediction, and muſt have a Divine Bleſſedneſs, if they are of a Divine Nature. Now his Lordſhip will not ſay, that theſe are Three Diſtinct Bleſſed Eſſences, and he ſays they are more than three Names, Oeconomies, or Modes; ſo that he cannot with conſiſtence call them three Bleſſed Names, Oeconomies, or Modes; and then what can he or any one elſe conceive by Three Bleſſed, but Three Bleſſed Perſons? For though it may be truly ſaid, that the higheſt Bleſſedneſs is that of Eſſence, yet none but a Perſon, or Perſons can be eſſentially Bleſſed. So that his Lordſhip aſſerting a Bleſſed Three, muſt againſt his will yield them to be three Perſons really diſtinct, though not divided. And ſo, when he ſays, that every one of that Bleſſed Three has a peculiar diſtinction in himſelf, this Pronoun [himſelf] is expreſly Perſonal; and ſo either the Perſonality is Real, or his Lordſhip very unaccurate in attributing a Perſonal Pronoun to every one of the Three, and ſo is at his choice either unaccurate, or ſelf-contradictory, or heretical, or, for the ſake of a bleſſed Comprehenſion, all together.

§. 9. Let

§. 9. Let us now consider his Lordship's proper Tradition of this third Opinion, or perhaps his own under the Colour of that, for 'tis not easie to find him. *This*, saith he, *is in general the Sum of the Received Doctrine, that in God's undivided Essence there are Three really different from each other, that are more than three Names, Oeconomies, or Modes.* But here is not one word of Persons, though asserted by the whole Catholick Church, by our own Articles and Liturgies, which his Lordship has sworn his unfeigned Assent and Consent to, and is by his Station bound to defend, and for which he has the great example of his late Metropolitan. What latent Ulcer is the Cause of this tergiversation I cannot exactly tell, but something there must be at the bottom. But since this being matter of Faith, must be taught every Proselyte before Baptism; let us see what efficacy his Lordship's *formula* will have when put into a Catechism. *Catechumen.* My Lord, I am an Heathen Philosopher, and willing to be instructed in the Principles of the Christian Faith; I pray what are they? *Bish.* First our received Doctrine is, That in the single Essence of God there are Three. *Catech.* Three what, my Lord? *Bish.* Three really distinct from one ano-

ther, more than three Names, Modes, or Oeconomies. *Catech.* My Lord, you tell me what they are not, but I would fain know, or have ſome notion what they are: And when you tell me there are Three, the Rules of Logick, Grammar, and Catechiſm require a Subſtantive to determine the Senſe; I pray, my Lord, has your Catholick Church, or your Church of *England* given them no Characteriſtick Name? *Biſh.* Yes, after Patripaſſianiſm aroſe, ſhe called them Perſons as a Teſt to diſcover them. *Catech.* But why then had you not thus ſtated the ſum of your received Doctrine, that in God's Unity of Eſſence there are Three Perſons? for if this were received before or ſince Patripaſſianiſm, 'tis received into your Chriſtian Confeſſions. Perhaps the Catholick Church may not really mean that they really are what ſhe calls them, that is, Perſons; and hence your Lordſhip thought fit to omit it; I pray, my Lord, deal openly with me, is it ſo, or how is it? *Biſh.* Truly, Sir, the Church only means that one is not the other; that is, all that is intended in the Term Perſon. *Catech.* This looks very Catachreſtical and Inartificial; but do not your Scriptures teach them to be Perſons? *Biſh.* No, they only call them by the Names of Father, Son or Word,

Word, and Holy Ghoſt. *Catech.* But do not your Scriptures and your Churches teach, that the firſt of theſe is really a Father, and the ſecond really his Son? *Biſh.* This is one of the three Opinions that the Scriptures do ſo teach. *Catech.* And is this the Opinion your Lordſhip will explain to me? *Biſh.* Yes, Sir. *Catech.* Are Father and Son then Perſonal Titles? *Biſh.* Yes, Sir, among Men. *Catech.* But are they not ſo in the Deity? *Biſh.* Sir, they are not called Perſons in Scripture, but only Father, Son or Word, and Holy Ghoſt; but we mean no more by Perſons, but that one is not the other; there are three, Sir, that you may depend on; but I pray, Sir, do not preſs me againſt liberty of Conſcience to call them Perſons, for I cannot tell what they are, nor what to call them. *Catech.* But, I pray, my Lord, why did your Apoſtle blame the *Athenian* Inſcription to the unknown God, and promiſed to declare him unto them, if he taught no more notions of him than that there are Three I know-not-whats in the God-head? I am in hope I ſhall find better information from your Fathers; I pray, my Lord, what is your Opinion of them herein? Biſh. *Perhaps, Sir, they have gone beyond due bounds, contradicted each other and them-*

ſelves, they uſe many impertinent Simile's, run out into much length and confuſion, while they talk of things to others which they underſtand not themſelves. Catech. My Lord, if you can teach me nothing of your Faith in God, if you will reject the terms of your Church, to which you have ſworn your unfeigned aſſent, if you diſſolve the Senſe of your Scripture Terms into nothing, and renounce the Wiſdom of your Primitive Fathers, you force me to retreat from my hopes, and to devote my Soul to the Society of the Philoſophers. This muſt be the Iſſue of ſuch a dry, ſenſleſs, inſipid State of the Faith, if offered to the Wiſe of the Heathen. Whereas the true Theory of the Faith is a moſt noble and ſeraphick Theology accounting for Creation and Providence, and all other Myſteries of Nature and Grace in ſo clear and heavenly a Light, that all the Idolatrous Notions and Fables of the Heathens, and all the celebrated Wiſdom of the Philoſophers, like *Dagon*, fell before it.

§. 10. Come we next to his Lordſhip's account of the Incarnation.

† P. 32, 33. † *The ſecond of this Bleſſed Three was united to a perfect Man, ſo that from the Humane and Divine Nature thus united, there did reſult the Perſon of the Meſſias,*

Meſſias, who was both God and Man. Now here it is to be noted, that this Expoſition of our Faith is his Lordſhip's own, after his Cenſure of the Primitive Doctrines herein, ſo that we muſt take this as moſt correct and exact. He then that hitherto omitted in his own accounts the Term Perſon in his Doctrine of the Trinity, admits it here concerning the *Meſſias*, and conſequently leaves us to conclude, that he judges it improper to be applied to the Trinity, but proper to the *Meſſias* or God Incarnate. And ſecondly, it is notorious that he denies the Perſonality of Chriſt to be Eternal, ſince he aſſerts it to reſult from the Union of two Natures. 'Tis true, indeed, the Royal or Sacred Character of Chriſt is Perſonal, that is, it muſt ſuppoſe Perſonality in the Subject ſo entitled; and it is certain alſo, that it was the Title of an Office of a Perſon to be incarnate, but this does not inferr, that the Perſonality of the *Meſſias* commenced or reſulted from his Incarnation. For an Eternal Perſon aſſumed our Nature ſo to become our threefold *Meſſias*: So that though the Character and Offices of Chriſt reſulted from the Incarnation, yet not the Perſon, or Perſonality; for to this the Humane Nature was aſſumed or pre-exiſtent, but added or contributed nothing thereunto. Where-

ſore upon this news of a reſulting Perſonality, I ask whether the Son of God was a Perſon antecedently to his Incarnation, or no? If not, this is down-right *Sabellianiſm*, if he was, then that antecedent Perſonality did not reſult from the Incarnation; but if you add another from the aſſumption of the Humanity, then this is *Neſtorianiſm*; if you conſound them into a compound, it is (I think) *Eutychianiſm*, ſince the two Perſonalities cannot be conſounded without confuſion of Natures and Subſtances. But if in the Conjunction of Natures one Perſonality excludes or deſtroys the other, nothing can reſult from that which is deſtroyed, but that Perſonality ſimply remains (as it was before) that deſtroyed the other. And further the Perſonality that deſtroys muſt be ſuperior to the deſtroyed; and if ſo, it's ten to one but the Divine and Eternal Perſonality of the Word is ſuperior to that of the Humane Nature, and ſo deſtroys it in the Union, and conſequently there reſults no Perſonality from the Humane Nature, but the Eternal Perſonality of the Word only remains ſimply as it ever was; and thus at laſt truth will come upon us whether we will or no; for I do not ſuppoſe his Lordſhip will be ſo hardy as to teach, that a created Perſonality will deſtroy an uncre-

uncreated by the conjunction of a created Nature with the Divine. Yet after all I believe his Lordſhip fixes the Perſonality, not in the whole *Theanthrôpus*, but only in the Humanity, if one could ſee his inſide; ſince he * makes the Manhood it ſelf a Perſon diſtinct from the Eternal Word that dwelt therein, and inſtead of confuting † helps thoſe Criticks that place their firſt Conceptions of the Sonſhip in the Humanity, and as to the Union he is ſo ambiguous, that he tells us not whether the Father and the Holy Spirit came into this reſulting Perſonality, or no, only ſaying without any peculiar reſtriction that God and Man became one Perſon, thus leaving a latitude for various Hereſies in this Myſtery.

* 45. *That Divine Perſon, in whom dwelt the Eternal Word*, &c.

† P. 32.

§. 11. So much then for the Perſonality; Advance we next to the Deity of the *Meſſias*. * *We believe*, ſaith he, *that Chriſt was God by vertue of the Indwelling of the Eternal Word in him. The* Jews *could make no Objection to this, who knew that their Fathers had worſhipped the Cloud of Glory, becauſe of God's reſting upon it.* And this he lays as a foundation, on which he may properly Deifie Chriſt's Humane

* P. 40.

mane Nature. But this *Jewiſh* Doctrine is abſolutely falſe, and is but either an heedleſs or willfull Depravation of the Learned Dr. *Whitby*'s chaſt and accurate * Theories herein. To make which appear in its proper viſage, let us conſider what Worſhip is in the ſenſe of his Lordſhip, with whom it imports † not only Incurvation of Body, which may be paid to Creatures, but Acts of Faith and Truſt, Prayers and Praiſes, &c. Now will his Lordſhip ſtare me, or any Man in the face, and ſay, that the *Jews* did thus Worſhip the Cloud of Glory? This I think will be routed by one Syllogiſm; whatſoever the *Jews* worſhipped according to the Law was God; The Cloud of Glory was not God; *Ergo* the *Jews* did not Worſhip the Cloud of Glory. I take it for granted, that this Syllogiſm is impenetrable, and let his Lordſhip try his skill upon it, if he pleaſe. It is indeed agreeable to truth, and learned Men teach, that *Iſrael* worſhipped God in the Cloud, over the Ark, in the Temple, as in all the Symbols and Places of his eſpecial Preſence; but the Symbols or Places themſelves were not the Objects of the *Jewiſh* Adoration, though Papiſts bend this

* Tractat. de ver. Jeſ. Chriſt. Deitat. p.

† *Lord of* Sarum, P. 38.

to

to the Adoration of the Host. And as simple as the Fathers are, they can inform his Lordship, † that *every Man whatsoever will own that in* Psalm 24. *neither* Solomon, *nor the Tabernacle, or Ark of the Testimony was the King of Glory, which they adored.* Yet that his Lordship's Conceits may have fair usage, I am content to lay together all that he has said to this purpose, to try whether they are in truth sound or adulterated, or whether they can bear a fair Tryal. He therefore teaches, † that 'tis evident from several forms of expressing that Cloud of Glory; *that a constant and immediate visible Indwelling of the Jehovah was according to Scripture Phrase said to be Jehova, which was applied to nothing else. This the Greek render* Κύριος, *which Term the Apostles universally applying to our Saviour, could mean no other but that he was the true Jehovah, by a more perfect dwelling of the Deity in him*, &c. Now here are two great Absurdities; first, that the visible Indwelling of the Jehovah is in Scripture phrase called

† *Just. Mart.* Dial. cum Tryph. ad ista *Psalm.* 24. Quis est Rex Gloriæ, Dominus Exercituum, &c. ὅτι γὰρ οὔτε περὶ Σαλομῶνος ἐκδόξου οὔτω βασιλέως ὄντος, οὔτε περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου, τῶν ἐφεστώτων τῶν πύλαις τοῦ ναοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἐτόλμησεν ἄν τις εἰπεῖν, τίς οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, πᾶς ὁστοῦν ὁμολογήσει.

† P. 36.

called Jehova; and ſecondly, that this Name was applied to nothing elſe. For firſt, 'tis he that dwelt between the Cherubims in a ſymbol of Glory over the Ark, firſt in the Tabernacle, after in the Temple, is called Jehovah, not his very Habitation. 'Tis the Title of the Reſident, not the Reſidence; and ſo his Lordſhip himſelf applies it alſo in contradiction either to himſelf, or the Scripture, if he expounds it rightly. That which perhaps led his Lordſhip into this fancy is, that *Shechinah* Grammatically ſignifies Habitation, and is thence taken by the *Rabbins* in a ſenſe peculiarly ſacred for the Majeſtick Preſence of God between the Cherubims, &c. and that he takes to be called Jehova. But his Lordſhip was not at leiſure to apprehend that the *Rabbiniek* uſe has turned the Grammatical notation of Habitation, that is but an accident, and made it to import that ſubſtantial Light and Glory, the Symbol of the Divine Preſence, the Scripture word Glory and the *Rabbiniek* Term *Shechinah* being equivalent. For the *Rabbins* by *Shechinah* mean not mere preſence, but that Lucid Glory by which God preſentiated himſelf. But if his Lordſhip will excuſe this unaccuracy, and ſay, That this Glory is called Jehova in the Scripture; yet this is alſo falſe,

and

and will not ſerve his turn. For this *Shechinah* is called * the Glory of *Jehovah*, and God is called † the King and * God of Glory with relation to the *Shechinah*; yet no Man will change the terms Glory of Jehovah thus, The Jehovah of Jehovah, or the God or King of Glory, into this form, The God or King of Jehovah, which yet might be done, if Jehova were the name of that Glory. When *Moſes* asked Jehovah to ſee a greater and more Majeſtatick Glory of the Divine Preſence, and that Jehovah made his Glory to paſs by, *Exod.* 33. 18, 21, 22. The Glory is plainly diſtinguiſhed from the Jehovah. For *Moſes* would not pray thus, O Jehovah ſhew me thy Jehovah, nor would the Jehovah ſay, my Jehovah ſhall paſs by. Jehovah therefore was not the mere *Shechinah*, either God's Habitation, or the Cloud of Glory, but he that preſentiated himſelf therein. And hence the ritual Worſhip of *Iſrael*, though performed toward that Cloud, was yet performed not to it, but to him whoſe Majeſty ſo appeared in or by it. Nor does this Symbol adequately come up to the Myſtery of the perſonal Union; for God's inhabiting in a Cloud of Glory did not make a perſonal

* כבוד יהוה
† *Pſal.* 24.
* *Act.* 7. 2.

Union

Union between God and the Cloud, as the inhabitation of God in Chriſt; Humane Nature being of an higher and more intimate and unitive Connexion, did; which yet however doth not really turn our Nature in Chriſt into Deity, except we will go over to *Eutychianiſm*, and a confuſion of Subſtance; nor do we adore his Humanity as ſo Deified, but we Worſhip the Eternal Son of God united to, and mediating for us in our Nature.

§. 12. But whereas his Lordſhip has outpitched all Mortals in ſaying, That in Scripture Phraſe Jehova never imports any thing elſe but a conſtant and viſible immediate Inhabitation, which has been ſufficiently baffled in the precedent Section, I will adventure to advance and ſay, that in the Scripture, the word Jehovah is uſed for God, without any imaginable reſpect to ſuch a *Shechinah*. In the Book of *Job* it is very often found, yet there being no *Shechinah* in his Land of *Uz*, the Author or Tranſlator could not uſe the term Jehovah concerning God appearing in the *Shechinah* of the Children of *Iſrael*, for *Job* was an Alien, and of the Line of *Eſau*. In thoſe infinite Places where the Creation, and all other Divine Works without the Land of *Canaan* are attributed to Jehovah,

there

there the name has no reſpect to the *Shechinah*. Whereſoever he is mentioned by this name in Affairs among the Ten Tribes, after their ſeparation by *Jeroboam* from the Worſhip at *Jeruſalem*, there is no reſpect to the *Shechinah*, for he had no ſuch among the Ten Tribes. When *Ezekiel* in Captivity before the deſtruction of the Temple mentions the Oracles of Jehovah, or God, by this name in the Land of the *Chaldeans*, he has no reſpect to a *Shechinah*. When the Temple was deſtroyed, there was never any *Shechinah* reſtored to that Temple any more; yet the inſpired Pen-men after this call him by the name Jehovah, for which I referr his Lordſhip to the Bible or the Concordances. And to conclude, the Eternal Wiſdom of the Father ſpeaking by *Solomon*, calls him Jehovah, with reſpect to ſuch a time, as was before all poſſibility of a *Shechinah*. Prov. 8. 22. *Jehovah poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way before his works of old.* And truly if Jehovah were the name of God only as in the *Shechinah*, then as it did not belong to him before the *Shechinah*, ſo it ceaſes to appertain to him ſince the extinction thereof in the diſſolution of the firſt Temple, except his Lordſhip will have it revive again by the σκήνωσις or Habitation of God in Chriſt's Humane

Humane Nature. But then as often as it was uſed by the High Prieſt (if not others) under the ſecond Temple, and after the ceſſation of other Prophets, till Chriſt came, by his Lordſhip's Criticiſm it muſt be improper, and the Prophets that called God Jehovah after the Deſtruction of the Temple, did miſname him. But after all, to keep up an old cuſtom, his Lordſhip adds another contradiction; for he ſays

*P. 38. * Jehovah is a federal name of God: Now if ſo, then was it properly uſed of God all the while the *Jews* were in the Old Covenant with God, which was till the Death of Chriſt ſurely; and conſequently all that tract of time in which there was no *Shechinah* from the ruin of the firſt Temple, was this name moſt proper.

§. 13. From the *Jewiſh Shechinah* come we to Chriſt, of whom his Lordſhip thus teaches, * that *Chriſt was God by*

*P. 40. *vertue of the Indwelling of the*

†P. 35. *Eternal Word in him*; † *that the Jehovah dwelt ſo immediately and bodily in Chriſt Jeſus, that by that Indwelling he was truly Jehovah,* * *that*

*P. 37. *he was the true Jehovah by a more perfect Indwelling of the Deity in him than that had been which was in the Cloud.* Now this

this muſt be grounded upon a Principle or Maxim, That whatſoever the Deity immediately inhabits (as it did the Cloud and the Humanity of Chriſt) that thing becomes God and the true Jehovah by virtue of that Inhabitation; and therefore the Cloud and the Humanity of Chriſt were the true Jehovah by this Reſidence; and if ſo, the Cloud and Chriſt are ſubſtantially the ſame thing, though yet the Cloud hath ceaſed to be for many Ages. And by the ſame Doctrine the inner Sanctuary of the Tabernacle and the Temple, and much more the Temples of our Bodies and Souls, in which Chriſt as God dwells immediately by his Holy Spirit, are the true Jehovah alſo by virtue of this Inhabitation. And beſides all theſe abſurdities, his Lordſhip's terms excluſively diverſifie the whole Chriſt who is inhabited, from the Eternal Word which does inhabit in him, and ſo according to his Lordſhip he becomes, if not a Socinian, yet a factitious God one way or other.

§. 14. Ay, But does not the Apoſtle juſtifie his Lordſhip's form of ſpeaking, when he ſaith,* *that in Chriſt dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*, which his Lordſhip† cites for his Authority? These are indeed the

* *Col.* 2. 9.
† P. 40.

Apoſtle's Words, and his Lordſhip cunningly refers to them, though never intended to his Lordſhip's Conſequences and Imaginations. For the Apoſtle ſeems to oppoſe the Gnoſtick *Pleromata*, excluding Chriſt from the Supreme *Pleroma* and Divinity. Now things are inexiſtent in others, either as things contained in things containing, or as parts in the whole, or one part in another. The firſt Mode cannot belong to the inexiſtence of the Deity in our nature; the ſecond or third form of inexiſtence may be conveniently aſſerted here. For firſt the whole Chriſt being a *Compoſitum* of the Word and Manhood, the God-head of the Word may be ſaid to be in Chriſt, as part in the whole. But if you take Chriſt here Synecdochically for that part of him which is diſtinct from the God-head, which is often done, ſometimes expreſly, as the Man Chriſt Jeſus, ſometimes implicitly from the neceſſary ſenſe of the Texts, then this Text will be thus interpretable, In Chriſt, *i. e.* the Man Chriſt, or his Manhood, dwelleth all the fullneſs of the God-head, as the ſuperior in the inferior part of the Θεάνθρωπος, and as the Soul in a Body. But neither of theſe Senſes inferr, that all that in which the fulneſs of the God-head dwells bodily, as a Soul in a Body, is thereby

thereby really God and the true Jehovah, for this would inferr an Eutychian confusion of Natures and Attributes. To illustrate this, his Lordship may observe, that we say, an excellent Soul is found in this Man, either as part in the whole, or strictly as the whole Man is put only for the Body; yet no Man will hence inferr, that all that in which the excellent Soul dwells thereby becomes a true Soul, for this would confound the two Natures into one. And truly as the formal Structure of his Lordship's words is heretical, so his Arguments for it from the *Jewish Shechinah* are Idolatrous, and will justifie Idolatry (*i.e.* Creature-Worship) both in *Jews* and *Christians*. 'Tis true, indeed, the Fathers generally teach a gracious, adoptive, and metaphorical Συναφεια of our nature in Christ, and of all Saints by him; but not so as to make that Nature, or these Saints, the true Jehovah, notwithstanding their mutual coinhabitation to all Eternity.

§. 15. It must be allowed, and I allow it freely, that the Argument brought from the perpetual rendring of Jehovah by Κύριος, and the signal appropriation of Κύριος in the New Testament to our Lord, while both Testaments establish only one and the same Lord, is in it self exceeding

good, and urged generally by moſt learned Men to this purpoſe; but however, it is almoſt marred by his Lordſhip's conjuring up an Objection, which he had not skill enough to lay. *The great Objection,* * ſays he, *that ariſeth againſt this, is, that though* יהוה *is indeed the common tranſlation for Jehovah; yet ſometimes it is put for other Hebrew words, both* Elohim *and* Adonai, *and that in the New Teſtament it is uſed rather in oppoſition, or more properly in ſubordination to the name of God, which ſeems to be ſtated very plainly by St.* Paul; † *when he ſays, there were many that were called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, as there were Gods many, and Lords many. In oppoſition to all which he aſſerts, that to Chriſtians there is but one God the Father, of whom were all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jeſus, by whom were all things, and we by him. From hence it ſeems, that the true Notion of this according to St.* Paul, *is, that as the Heathen Nations believed ſome ſupreme Deities, and other deputed or lower Deities that watched over particular Nations; ſo we Chriſtians do own one only Eternal God the Creator and Conſerver of all, and one Lord to whom he has given the Government of all things.*

* P. 37.

† 1 Cor. 8. 5, 8.

things. So that this, as it favours the Notion of one exalted to Divine Authority and Honour, does take away quite the whole force of this Argument. Now let us ſee how his Lordſhip ſolves this. The ſum of what at large he tells us is,† that he that is at large the God of the Univerſe, was alſo the federal God and Lord of the *Jews*, and his federal name was Jehova rendred Κύριος, as the Heathens alſo were ſuppoſedly under the Dominion of ſome of their Supreme Deities. So here St. *Paul* ſets one God for us, who is alſo our federal God, Lord, or Jehovah by his dwelling in the Humane Nature of Jeſus Chriſt. But certainly 'tis hazardous to hang ſo weighty a point of Faith on ſo thin a Cob-web. For what, firſt of all, if a Man ſhould deny Jehovah to be a Name reſtrictively and relatively federal to one People, how will his Lordſhip convince him? It is for the moſt part put by it ſelf, ſeldom with any Genitive, never that I have yet obſerved with a Genitive of that People. And being put ſimply it is a name of pure and abſolute Eſſence or Exiſtence, and altogether irrelative even to the whole World, as properly belonging to his Eternal Being before all Worlds. And yet it may conſequently import a negative reflexion on the Non-

† P. 37, 38.

exiſtence of all other Heathen Gods. It ſeems indeed † prefixed to the relative and federal Name, which was the God of their Fathers, the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, declared unto *Moſes* * before the name Jehovah was given: But it is plain that he was long before the federal God of their Fathers, under the myſtical name of *Elohim*, *Adonai*, and *Elſchaddai*, before ever *Moſes* was. But till the appearance in the Buſh, God was not known to the Fathers by the name * Jehovah, though he was their federal God of Old. So that this name Jehovah, when added, is added as a name of Eſſence to the federal Titles of the God of their Fathers, the God of *Iſrael*, which were ſet ſo relatively to that People, in oppoſition to thoſe relative Titles and local Denominations, which the Heathen gave their tutelar and reſpective Deities. And this I take for a certain Rule, that an Abſolute name of God is ſet alone, and a federal name always with a Genitive Caſe, or Suffix. Nay, *Moſes* expreſly uſes the name Jehovah without this federal relation in the Story of *Balaam*, * whom with *Balak* alſo

† *Exod.* 15.16. יהוה אלהי אבותיכם

* Ibid. v. 6. 13.

* *Exod.* 6. 3.

* *Num* 22.8.13.& 23. 3, 8, 12, 26. & 24. 6. 13.& 23.17.& 24.11

alſo *Moſes* makes to call God Jehovah. And if it ſhall be pretended that they uſed this as the known federal Name, for that *Balaam* ſaid of *Iſrael*, † *Jehovah his God is with him*, it is to be obſerved that the ſame *Meſopotamian* Diviner calls him by the ſame Term * Jehovah my God. And the ſame *Moſes*, or whoſoever gave us the Book of *Job* in *Hebrew*, names the God of *Job* * Jehovah, and † brings in *Job* calling him by that name, though neither *Job*, nor probably the Original Author of that Book, was of the Children of *Iſrael*, nor within their eſpecial Covenant. Nay, God himſelf diſcharges this name from all federal reſtriction. *Behold, I am Jehovah the Lord God of all fleſh.* And in thoſe numerous places, wherein he is relatively called Jehovah Iſebaoth the Lord of Hoſts, the Hoſts of Heaven are denoted, not the Armies of *Iſrael*, though ſometimes † theſe two Titles, the Jehovah or Lord of Hoſts, and God of the Armies of *Iſrael*, are joyned together, of which however the latter only is federal to

† *Numb.* 23. 21. יהוה אלהיו *Numb.* 22. 18. * יהוה אלהי

* *Job* Ch. 1. Ch. 2. Ch. 38. Ch. 40. Ch. 42. † Ch. 1. v. 21.

† 1 *Sam.* 17. 45.

that People. And infinite other * Texts there are to ſhew Jehovah to be a name unlimited, and in its natural ſignification antecedent to that of the God of *Iſrael* *, and to be acknowledged by all Nations in their general Converſion. But further, if the Septuagint uſed Κύριος as a ſederal Name in the rendring the *Hebrew* Jehovah, yet does it not follow, that they took Jehovah for a ſederal Name. For where-ever they render it Κύριος (as I believe they do every where) there they according to the cuſtom of their Nation read יהוה by *Adonai*, according as they have ſince pointed it for that way of reading, a religious firſt, and at laſt a ſuperſtitious fear reſtraining the People from the common pronunciation of that greateſt Name. And hence it will follow, that the Septuagint might take *Adonai* for a ſederal Name of God, as their tutelar Lord in oppoſition to the *Baalim*, or Lords adored by the bordering Nations. So that whereas his Lordſhip throws up not only *Elohim*, but *Adonai* too, to the Objection, he has undermined his own foundation for the ſederal ſignification of Κύριος, eſpecially ſince in

* *Pſal.* 144. 15. *Zech.* 13. 19.

* *Zech.* 14 9.

in the 110*th. Psal.* God the Father is called *Jehovah, and God the Son *Adonai*, the chiefest Text cited out of the Old Testament in the New for the Dominion of Christ over his People, and consequently an argument that the New Testament Κύριος came from the Septuagint, as reading *Adonai*. How then shall the Apostles sense be cleared, so that it may not establish two adorable Lords and Gods, nor make Christ a Lord only by Advancement and Oeconomy? And hereunto, first let it be noted, that this was written not to Aliens or Infidels, and Strangers to our Faith; for to such, I confess, it had not been so perfectly clear and intelligible, but to a Christian Church, who all from the highest to the lowest had been taught the mystery of the Trinity in Unity; and to these St. *Paul*'s words are as intelligible in their truth as the Apostles Creed or any other, which an uninitiated Heathen might easily misunderstand, either to conclude our Lord not to be God, as being not called God in the Apostles Creed, (which Hereticks and Latitudinarians lay hold of to their evil Ends) or another God; because in other formularies he is called God of God. But this fundamental

* נאם יהוה לאדני εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου.

mental Inſtitution, that we have no other God nor Lord than the *Jews* had, and that Lord of the *Jews* being only one God Almighty, we cannot err in underſtanding this Creed of St. *Paul*, or any other, to believe that Chriſt is a Lord in nature different from God the Father Almighty. To exhibit this more clearly, I will ſet theſe words of St. *Paul*, and thoſe of the Nicene Creed that are moſt appoſite to them, and liable to an Heathen miſconſtruction.

St. *Paul's* Creed.

To us there is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things.

The Nicene Creed.

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things viſible and inviſible, and in one Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, very God of very God, by whom all things were made. —— Now to ſhew the moſt deſigned intention of St. *Paul's* words, and that they do not at all give any colour to the Socinian notion of one advanced to Divine Honour, but make him with God the Father Creator of all things, I ſhall digeſt them into a due Paraphraſe, thus; *For though the Heathen Wor-*

Worſhippers of Idols have many celeſtial and terreſtrial Gods, as they call them, which they Worſhip by their Idols, their Superſtition to their falſly ſo called Gods ariſing from this truth, that God hath ſet Preſidential and Tutelary Powers over us, who are therefore by Office, though not by Nature, Gods and Lords, as the Angelical Princes of Greece *and* Perſia, *and here on Earth the Kings and Rulers of the World; yet we Chriſtians have but one Almighty God the Father, from whom all things originally are, and we are in him, or for him; and one only Tutelar Lord next God the Father, Jeſus Chriſt, by whom we were created, and by whom we ſubſiſt, for the Object of our Adoration.* By this Paraphraſe it appears, that the Father is called God, and Chriſt Lord, but the Creation attributed to both in this form of diſtinction, that all things are of, or from God the Father as the firſt Original, and by the Lord Chriſt, becauſe by him the Father created all things; and hence it follows, that the Lord Chriſt in that nature which created all things is uncreated, and if uncreated, then of the ſame Deity of the Father, who by him created all things, and hence adorable with the Father; whereas the Heathen Gods, and all other Gods by deputation or advance-

ment

ment are not adorable, as not being Authors of our Creation and Being, nor uncreated in themſelves. Whatſoever Hebrew word therefore Κύριος or Κύριε in this place may be referred to; yet our Κύριε our Lord Jeſus, being as our Lord and Creator, the Object of our Adoration is vindicated from the reproach of a Creature advanced to the Honour of Divine Adoration, by the very context it ſelf. And to this ſenſe the words were fully clear to the Chriſtian Church, who knew St. *Paul*, both as a *Jew* and *Chriſtian*, an utter Adverſary to all Creature-worſhip. But however, I note here that Κύριε ſpoken of Chriſt, anſwers not to the Hebrew Jehovah; for being ſet oppoſite to the many Κύριοι, it muſt anſwer to a word in Hebrew, that is capable of a plural number, which Jehovah is not, for there cannot be a plurality of Jehovahs. But what ſhall be done to convince an Arian, who will confeſs our Lord a Sub-Creator of all things beſide under the Father, and ſo their Lord on the Title of that Creation, though himſelf was created by God the Father? Why this place muſt be interpreted by others, ſuch as that he is God, the true God, God over all bleſſed for ever, that he was ever in the form of God, and equal with God

the

the Father, and one with him, all which will bear weight, while the ſederal whimſie vaniſhes into ſoft air. And therefore after all his critical triſling, he wiſely † comes to this way of interpretation, and ſays a great many Good and Orthodox truths on this Article ſo far as that that Chriſt was God, who manifeſted himſelf in our fleſh, which being ſo diſſonant to all his former Modes of expreſſion and avowed Notions, ſeem to have dropp'd from him either unawares, or for a colour of defence againſt a foreſeen charge of Hereſie, or perhaps the ſingular Providence of God might ſo over-rule the madneſs of the Prophet, to make him ſpeak that for the Chriſtian Faith, which he had no mind to, that his manifeſt inconſiſtencies might render him of no Authority for the uſe of Hereticks either in preſent or future Ages.

† P. 38-40.

§. 16. His Lordſhip's laſt Argument for the Deity of Chriſt is, † that the *Jews*, and Apoſtates from Chriſtianity never charged the Apoſtles nor the Church with Idolatry or Creature-Worſhip, which they would certainly have done, had the Chriſtian Principles been Arian, or Socinian. And had there been any ſuch Objection, we ſhould have had the

† P. 39, 40.

the Apologies of the Apoſtles againſt it. For ſo we find them vindicating themſelves againſt the Charge of the *Jews*, for quitting the Moſaical Ordinances, and calling the *Gentiles*, things of leſs prejudice than the worſhipping and Deifying a Creature. Now for my part, I believe it was the common *opprobrium* both of *Jews* and *Gentiles* and perfect Apoſtates, that the *Chriſtians* adored a mere Malefactor, and that ſurely is an imputation of Creature-Worſhip; and though we find it not in the *Acts*, or Epiſtles of the Apoſtles expreſly charged; yet many paſſages aſſerting his Deity, ſeem directly ſet in oppoſition to ſuch calumnies. In the *Acts* of the Apoſtles the recorded diſputes with the *Jews* are, whether our Jeſus was the true *Meſſias*, for on conceſſion of this, all the other Doctrines of Chriſtianity were to have been admitted without ſcruple; and ſo the queſtions of his Deity and Adoration came not into courſe with the *Jews*, while they denied this Truth, that was firſt to be proved in order to their conviction, that he was the Chriſt. And all that is written againſt Judaiſm in the Epiſtles, is againſt Judaizing Chriſtians, or Semi-Chriſtian Judaizers, that adhered to the Levitical Inſtitutes as neceſſary to all Chriſtians. Now theſe not making Chriſt

an

an Idol or a mere Creature, there was no need of a Vindication of us with them againſt an Idolatry that they charged us not with; but againſt thoſe Hereticks that made Jeſus a mere Man, and conſequently would impeach us for the Worſhip of a Creature, St. *John*'s Goſpel and firſt Epiſtle were expreſly written; and theſe were a ſort of Un-Chriſtian Judaizers of ſeveral Characters from their proper Authors. So that his Lordſhip's Obſervation, though never ſo well intended, is however partly falſe, and partly impertinent. And yet allowing this Argument as much force as can be deſignedly granted it, it will amount to no more than this, That the Enemies of our Religion could not upbraid us with a profeſſed Worſhip of a profeſſed Creature, becauſe he whom the Chriſtians worſhipp'd in our fleſh, was by them owned to be the Eternal God: Yet no doubt the *Jews* ever did, and do at this Day charge us with the Worſhip of a vile Creature, who really (as they think) had no Deity in him; elſe, had they alſo thought him to be God, they had been *ipſo facto* converted to us, the want of this Faith being the only Bar to their Converſion; and the cauſe why they execrate both our Lord and us for this very Doctrine. So unluckly

is his Lordſhip, even in the faireſt part of this Diſcourſe, as if God had laid this Curſe on him, that he that had ſophiſtically handled the Chriſtian Faith in moſt part of it, ſhould not have the Glory or Comfort of having ſerved it in any one particular.

A Vindi-

A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers againſt the Imputations of Gilbert, *Lord Biſhop of* Sarum, *&c.*

PART II.

§. 1. I Have now (I think) performed my firſt undertaking, that his Lordſhip hath ill ſtated the Doctrines of our Faith: A truth ſo evident to his own Clergy, even thoſe that would throw a friendly skirt over theſe Nudities, that they aſcribe all (or ſeem willing ſo to do) to haſte, inconſideration, and want of judgment, not to any heretical Deſigns or Contrivances. Whether his Lordſhip will be thankful for theſe kinds of Excuſe, I cannot tell, but at the beſt they are but Fig-leaves. For

can any Candour excuſe an heedleſs or injudicious Lecture in a Biſhop or Divinity Profeſſor, firſt uttered to a learned Body, and after expoſed to the Cenſure of the World, in a matter moſt fundamental in Chriſtianity, moſt liable to prejudices; and this after the moſt accurate determinations of the Church Univerſal; eſpecially ſince he ſo openly upbraids the Fathers and Patrons of this Faith, with their unaccuracies and impertinencies, and this not in their particular and private conceptions, which the Church hath not authorized, but in their moſt Catholick and eſtabliſhed Theories? Surely ſuch a Cenſor ought to have been accurate above all Men, and not to have needed the Candor of a Reader.

§. 2. This dealing with the Fathers is ſuch an indecent ſort of immorality, that 'tis not to be endured in one of his Lordſhip's Character. The Fathers, it is true, were Men, and they have their παραπτώματα, thoſe ſlips here and there incident to the infirmities of Humane Nature, and if his Lordſhip had reverently touched upon any of theſe, not with a deſign to blacken their memory, but only to caution his Clergy againſt ſuch forms or notions, he had dealt very commendably. But it falls out

out quite otherwiſe. For he Taxes them for no real obliquities, but their Catholick Principles; fixes on them ſuch Theories as they never dreamed of, and ſuch as are deſtructive of their own avowed Faith, and this without quoting ſo much as one paſſage out of them: he gives them not ſo much as one good word, but finally preſents them to us as a parcel of impertinent and ſelf contradicting Bablers; which how it conduces to the encouraging Deiſm and Hereſie, I humbly leave to the Cenſure of my Holy Mother the Church of *England*. Sure I am, as this ill office was utterly needleſs to his Expoſition of the Faith, ſo modeſty ought to have repreſſed it; if for no other conſideration, yet for this one reaſon, That they may receive him into their Society with joy at the day, when he ſhall be gathered unto his Fathers.

§. 3. The Buſineſs then of this ſecond part is to diſcuſs the truth and juſtice of his Lordſhip's Imputations caſt upon theſe Holy Worthies, which he introduces thus, by telling his Clergy, *that* † *he will not pretend to inform them how this Myſtery is to be underſtood*, and in what reſpect theſe Perſons (which he calls ſo according to cuſtom, not his own ſenſe)

† P. 31.

are believed to be one, and in what reſpects they are Three. By explaining a Myſtery can only be meant the ſhewing how it is laid down and revealed in Scripture; for to pretend to give any other Account of it, is to take away its myſterionſneſs, when the manner how it is in it ſelf is offered to be made intelligible. Now what doth this *prima facie* intimate, but that it is not laid down in the Scripture, in what reſpect the Perſons are one, nor in what reſpect they are Three. But firſt in the Doctrine of Unity, I think the Scriptures do ſufficiently teach, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one in reſpect of Eſſence, notwithſtanding all the wriggles of Hereticks, not only in that paſſage of St. *John* 1 *Ep.* 5. 7. which his Lordſhip has expoſed * for doubted, but in many others. And if his Lordſhip dares deny this reſpect of Eſſence to be taught by the Scriptures concerning the Unity, I will adventure the proof of it. But if his Lordſhip be not ſo hardy, then let him recant this Impeachment of the Scriptures, that they have not taught us in what reſpect the Perſons are One. I am however content that Men of Candour take this only for an heedleſs ſlip, not a deſigned Artifice. Let it

* *Letter* I *from* Zurich.

it be ſo; yet is it a dangerous one, and uſed by the Men of the broad way that leadeth to deſtruction, to the ſervice of heretical Comprehenſions. The Antapologiſt to Dr. *Sherlock* owns the forequoted Text of St. *John* for undoubted; *There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and theſe Three are One.* This, ſaith he, is Scripture, * but how they are one the Scripture teacheth not. What is this ſetch for, but that we may not preſs the Heretick's to own an eſſential Unity, but whatſoever elſe will ſerve their ſeveral Turns, and deliver them from the Canon of the Faith? But ſecondly, his Lordſhip ought to have inſtructed his Clergy in what reſpects they are Three, according to the Scriptures, which do inſtruct us herein, with certain notions and reſpects, by which they are diſtinguiſhed from each other in the Unity of Eſſence. For are not Father and Son Perſonal Characters, and founded on a ſubſtantial generation, the Father being the Perſon Generant as ſuch, and the Son the Perſon generated as ſuch? And is not the *Logos* the ſubſtantial Iſſue of the Eternal Mind, and as ſuch diſtinguiſhed from its Parent? The Holy Spirit is of the Father and the Son,

* *Antap.* p. 5.

and does the perſonal Offices of a Paraclete by miſſion from the Father and the Son, on which account he hath perſonal and diſtinctive Pronouns and Attributes given him. Which ſhews the form of diſtinction to be Perſonal, and the different Mode of their deſcent, origination, and miſſion. So much therefore of the Modes of their diſtinction being taught by the Scriptures, is alſo well taught by the Church, and ought to have been ſo by his Lordſhip; though other Modes of this Subſiſtence, that are not revealed, paſs our meaſures and capacities, and Men's inauthentick ſpeculations on them are not to be admitted for Catholick or Canonical.

§. 4. And now we come to conſider the exorbitances of the Fathers in their teaching the Reſpects and Modes of this Unity and Diſtinction. † In this (ſaith his Lordſhip) *too many both Ancients and Moderns have perhaps gone beyond due bounds, while ſome were pleaſed with the Platonical Notions of Emanations, and a fœcundity in the Divine Eſſence.* Now here it muſt be noted, that the Ancients and Moderns, which his Lordſhip here ſpeaks of, are the Defenders of the Faith of the Trinity againſt the Arian and other Ancient Hereſies. Now as great

† P. 31.

Friend s

Friends as my Lord and *Petavius* are, I would fain know how they can be reconciled herein. For if * *Arius* were a genuine Platoniſt in the created pre-exiſtence of the *Logos*, how came any of the Anti-Arian Ancients to be Platonick in their Doctrines of Eternal Pre-exiſtence and Emanations? 'Tis hard that Arians and Catholick Fathers ſhould both be in the ſame Platonick Errors, in a point in which they were contradictory, and in which alone their great diviſion was founded. But as for the Eternal Emanations aſſerted by the Fathers, they were taught purely from all ill mixtures of Platoniſts and others, in that while they from ſacred Tradition aſſert thoſe Efluxes, yet they all deny them to be like corporeal Emanations by corporeal abſciſſions or diviſions of parts. It would be endleſs to cite places of this kind. Let it ſuffice that the Doctrine of Emanation * was pure *Jewiſh* Theology; by which term received into the forms of Chriſtian Theology, they meant the derivation of the whole Divinity from the Father to the *Logos* and the Holy Spirit, without

* *Petav.* citat *Bullo.* in Procem. Defenſ. Fid. *Nicen.* p. 8.

* Sap. Sal. 7. 25. ἀπόῤῥοια.

without † any division, or partition of Substance. For the truth of which I referr instead of many to one *Athanasius*, that spake the sense of the whole Church in his time, and of the Fathers before him. Now the Fathers all denying an emanation, which like that of Bodies consists in abscission of Parts, will hereby be discharged from the fancies of Platonick Emanations, which the * Defender of Dr. *Sherlock*'s Notion of a Trinity in Unity charges with such Abscission in the Platonick Triad. We are not yet advanced to the Beatifick Vision, nor the tongues of Angels, nor, if we were, could we adequately describe the glorious Mysteries of these Divine Subsistences; yet God himself gives us leave to speak of his revealed Truths herein according to our infirmities; that we, who see these Mysteries remotely and only by dark resemblances, may communicate those notions in as remote forms of expression,

† *Athan.* Expos. Fid. οὐκ ἀποῤῥοίαν τοῦ τελείου, οὐ τμῆσιν τῆς ἀπαθοῦς φύσεως. Id. de Syn. Nic. con. Arian. decret. οὕτως ἄλλως ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένεσις καὶ ἄλλως ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ παντός· τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων τὰ γεννήματα μέρη πως τῶν γεννώντων εἰσίν· ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὴ τῶν σωμάτων ἡ φύσις οὐκ ἀπλῆ τίς ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ ῥευστὴ καὶ ἐκ μερῶν ἐχει τὴν σύνθεσιν· ἀποῤῥέουσί τε ἄνθρωπον γεννῶντες, καὶ ἐπιῤῥεῖ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἐξοφῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσαγόμενα· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἀμερὴς ὢν ἀμερίστως ἐστὶ, καὶ ἀπαθὴς τοῦ υἱοῦ πατήρ· οὔτε γὰρ ἀποῤῥοὴ τοῦ ἀσωμάτου ἐστίν.

* P. 28.

expreſſion, while we keep however to the Schemes himſelf has ſet us, and embaſe thoſe Theories with no Humane Corruptions. And hence I freely allow the words of Emanation, as being taken from the Images of corporeal Effluxes, not to be fully equal to the Myſtery intended, but ſuch as would be apt to lead us into craſs and material conceptions of the Deity, did not our Theology expreſly foreſend us. But under this guard the terms are not only innocent, but Authentick, and that Authority with the Fathers deſcended not from *Plato*, but from Canonical and allowed Scriptures, which have ſet corporeal Emanations as dark Symbols of theſe internal Communications of the Divine Eſſence in the Trinity; of which ſort of Similes are the * ἀπαυγάσματα, the Rays and Emanations of Light and Glory; and the ſtreams of Fountains, from which in the Scriptures the Fathers have taken thoſe Emanatory forms of expreſſion, which therefore owe not their Authority or Reception to *Plato*; that ſo his

* *Athan.* ad *Serap.* Sp. S. non eſſe Creaturam. πῶς περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος τις ἐξειπεῖν δύναιτο; ὅμως δ' ἂν τὴν τοιαύτην ἀπορίαν δυνήσεται τις θεραπεῦσαι, προηγουμένως μὲν τῇ πίστει ἐπεῖτα δὲ καὶ ὀκνῶν τῶν προειρημένων φημὶ δὲ τῆς εἰκόνος, καὶ τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος, καὶ πηγῆς, καὶ ποταμοῦ, καὶ ὑπαρκτήρ[illegible]σεως, καὶ χαρακτῆρ[illegible].

Lordſ[illegible]

&c. —— καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἀδύνατον τῆς διὰ Λόγων ἑρμηνείας καὶ τοῦ καταλαβεῖν τὰ τοιαῦτα Ἀραμυθουμένη ἡ θεία γραφὴ τοιαῦτα καὶ παραδείγματα ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν, &c. Id. de Syn. Nic. con. *Arian.* Decret. διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ἅγιοι — εἰκόνα τινὰ δεδώκασιν ἡμῖν ὀκ τῶν ὁρωμένων λέγοντες, ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα, —— καὶ χαρακτὴρ — καὶ πάλιν ὅτι παρά σοι πηγὴ ζωῆς, —— ἐγκατελίπετε τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας· αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ πηγὴ ἡ λέγουσα, ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον· πηγὴν ὕδατος ζῶντος. Vid. con. *Arian.* Orat. 3.

Lordſhip ſhould call them Platonical in derogation to the Grandeur of the Chriſtian Theology; like the reproach of *Amelius* upon St. *John*, as if he alſo had preached the Philoſopher. 'Tis true, indeed, the Primitive Fathers writing for our Faith againſt Gentiliſm, do often cite this Philoſopher, not as an Author of our Principles, but as a good witneſs to the *Greeks* for their Credibility, though ſometimes, when upbraided with him by the Heathens, they freely call him a plagiary of the *Jewiſh* and Sacred Theology, which he afterwards cook'd up after a *Greek* Mode. Now the Corruptions in *Plato*'s Doctrine of the Trinity the Fathers uſe not, nor are pleaſed with, but thoſe ſeeds of true Theology that are in him, they love and cheriſh, not as *Plato*'s, but as God's; the Wiſdom of God having graciouſly permitted ſome Notions and Rudiments of Faith to be conveyed to the Wiſe of the Heathen, before the publication of Chriſtianity, to prepare

prepare a way for its after-reception and vindication among them. And having thus vindicated the Ancients in their Doctrines of these Essential Emanations, let me observe how tectly sly and abusive his Lordship's Reflexion on them is: Some, saith he, were pleased with the Platonical Notions of Emanation, as if all the Catholick Ancients had not the same Notions of Emanation, but some were for, and some against these Emanations. But here it had been fair to have graced the Margin with the Catalogue of the Emanatory and Anti-emanatory Ancients; and I do here urge and challenge his Lordship to produce them *in foro* to speak for themselves, before sentence be passed upon them. This I doubt is an hard task, but a demand that cannot be denied me without shame. But it seems these Platonick Ancients were grown old unto Dotage, and become Children again, and as such were pleased, poor Souls, with the pretty Baubles that *Plato* invented for them; and thus we have made a good beginning upon the Fifth Commandment, if the Sense thereof may extend to the Fathers of our Religion, and the Church.

§. 5. To the absurdity of Emanations succeeds that of fœcundity in the Divine Essence,

ſence, which his Lordſhip taxes in both Ancients and Moderns, that is, moſt eminently in St. *Athanaſius* and Biſhop *Pearſon*, that were in their reſpective Ages, the exacteſt and graveſt Divines in the World, without exception or diminution of any, that indulged not to Humane Wit or Fancy in their Theological Theories, but relyed wholly on the force of the Scriptures and the Tradition of their Fathers. Now * *Athanaſius* ſo far inſiſted on this Doctrine of fœcundity, that he looked on it as neceſſary againſt both *Sabellianiſm* and *Arianiſm*, both which Hereſies ſtood on this Principle, (which was therefore heretical) that there is no fœcundity in the Divine Eſſence, for the conceſſion of this inferrs the Eternal Perſonality and Exiſtence of the Son. And the wonderful † *Pearſon* ſticks to this Doctrine of fœcundity as eſſential to our Faith, not only againſt theſe Elder Hereticks, but their Baſtards alſo, the *Mahometans*; and is it not an unaccountable ſort of

* *Athan.* con. *Sabell. Greg.* — ὡς ἄγονον ὢν, καὶ ἄκαρπον ζῶντος λόγου καὶ σοφίας ἀληθινῆς. Id. con. *Arian.* Orat. 2. καὶ ἄγονος ἦν ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ξηρός. — διὸ πότε ὁ πατὴρ ξηρός. Id. con. *Arian.* Orat. 3. αὐτὸς δὲ καὶ ἐκείνως μὴ ὢν γεννητικὸς φύσεως, — εἰ δὲ μὴ καρποφόρος ἔστιν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς οὐσία, διὰ τοῦτο ἄγονος καὶ αὐτὸς, ὡς φῶς μὴ φωτίζον, καὶ πατὴρ ξηρός, &c.

† *Expoſ. of the Creed. Artic. His only Son.*

of confidence or ignorance in his Lordſhip to joyn with *Sabellians*, *Arians*, and *Mahometans* in flurting at the Doctrine of fœcundity, on which alone ſtands the Faith in the Father and the Son? Either therefore let his Lordſhip deny, or own this fœcundity? if he deny it, let him be anathema; if he owns it, why doth he accuſe the Fathers and Moderns that teach it, as tranſgreſſing due bounds? But, perhaps, it was neceſſary to do that by oblique reflexion, which it is not yet ſafe to do by open mouth to avoid an open conviction. But a Man is as well known by his hints as proteſtations, and, perhaps, much better.

§. 6. Let us now ſee how Heatheniſh his Lordſhip makes theſe Divine and Catholick Notions of the Fathers. † *For*, ſaith he, *we have footſteps of a Tradition, as ancient as any we can trace up, which limited the Emanations to Three. And theſe thought there was a production, or rather an eduction of two out of the firſt, in the ſame manner that ſome Philoſophers thought, that Souls were propagated from Souls, and the figure by which this was explained, being that of one Candle being lighted at another, this ſeems to have given the Riſe to thoſe words Light of Light. It is certain that many of the Fathers fell often* * P. 31.

often into this conceit, &c. Now ſure I am, that I have ſet his Lordſhip's words in their due connexion with thoſe cited in the laſt Section: And are the reaſon aſſigned, why they exorbitated beyond due bounds that taught Emanations and Fœcundity, becauſe the Notion is Platonick and the Tradition heatheniſh and falſe. For thoſe (which his Lordſhip notes) who limited the Emanations to three, reſembled it to the imagined propagation of Souls, and lighting of Candles, and conſequently from theſe [Heathens] came our Light of Light. This is the true Grammar Senſe of his Lordſhip's Words. For the Relative *theſe* reſpects the Heathens only laſt before-mentioned, and the repreſentation by Souls propagated and Candles lighted, reflect back only on the Heathen Tradition, and is not this a great Credit to the *Nicene formula*, to have ſuch an heathen and exorbitant Original? The Diſcourſe to this period is of an heathen Tradition, heatheniſhly expounded by the Similes of Souls propagated, and Candles lighted; for I dare engage no Catholick Author ever repreſented the Eſſential Fœcundity and Emanations in the Deity, by thoſe Figures of Souls and Candles, that thence probably his Lordſhip might be thought to have ſet

theſe

theſe as the Figures of Chriſtian Authors, of which he makes no mention within theſe words here cited. Afterward indeed he tells for certain, that many of the Fathers fell often into this conceit, which he owns to be heatheniſh, and gives it no other original, either in Scripture or *Jewiſh* Tradition. The moſt that can be moſt favourably imagined (though contrary to the order of his Lordſhip's words) is that the Tradition was heatheniſh, though dreſſed up by Chriſtian Ancients under the Similes of Souls propagated and Candles lighted, *for many of the Fathers moſt certainly fell often into this conceit*, and ſo probably came our *Nicene formula* Light of Light. The upſhot then is; the Tradition of Emanation and Fœcundity is exorbitant and heatheniſh, ſet off either by Heathen or Chriſtian Expoſitors by the exorbitant Similes of Souls and Candles, from which Figure of Candles probably came the *Nicene* form Light of Light. That this is the genuine ſenſe of his Lordſhip is manifeſt, for he accuſes theſe Principles as exorbitant, for this cauſe, that they are heatheniſh, and ſet off with ill Similes, one of which was probably the ground of the *Nicene* Confeſſion. For, if his Lordſhip will not own this ſenſe, let him declare, if

the

the Simile of one Candle lighted from another, give a regular notion of the Faith in the Doctrine of Emanations and Fœcundity? If it does, why does he blame the Doctors of thoſe Emanations, Fœcundities, and Similes, as Men that have gone beyond due bounds, and fallen into theſe exorbitant conceits? But if he will ſtand to it that theſe Doctrines and their Similes are irregular conceits, than the *Nicene* form has an ill foundation in his Lordſhip's profeſſed Opinion. But, before I come to vindicate the true Originals of the *Nicene* form, I will examine the truth of this Hiſtory, whether many of the Fathers often fell into this conceit; that the Emanations in the Divine Eſſence are *of the ſame manner that ſome Philoſophers thought Souls propagated from Souls, or Candles were lighted from Candles.* Sure I am, the Conceits and Similes are not only improper, but contrarily diſſimilar to the Notions of the Catholick Theology. For this teaches a co-eternal Emanation of the ſecond and third Perſons, with a co-eternal and inſeparable Unity, and eſſential Dependence of the two latter on the firſt Perſon; but Souls propagated from Souls, and Candles lighted from Candles are neither coæval, nor united, nor dependant one on the other,

other, and ſo are fitter for an *Arian* than a Catholick Simile; though, I confeſs it not fit for all *Arian* conceptions neither. Theſe then being ſuch abſurd conceits charged upon many Fathers, as often uſed by them, one ſhould have hoped for a large liſt of them, and the places cited in the Margin; but, alas! here is no ſuch direction either for the Student or Examinant. And for my own part, I confeſs, I never remember any ſuch conceit in any Father. Of the imagined propagation of Souls, I have not made the leaſt obſervation among the Fathers; but of what may ſeem to come near theſe Candles, or might occaſion this raſh conceit of his Lordſhip for want of memory or care, I will here offer. Now firſt, I confeſs, I have found this myſtery * aſſimilated to the light, motion, and heat of fire, which are all coæval. I have alſo obſerved a Simile of fire, generating fire in it ſelf, brought by † St. *Hilary* to illuſtrate the Homoouſion, with an excuſe for its ſingularity and indignity, to which he was forced hereby to ſuccour the Faith of the plainer

* *Athenag.* Legat. ἀπαύγασμα ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα. *Aug.* Exp. in *Joh.* c. 5. Tract. 20. & Ser. 199. De quinq; Hæreſib. & de Verbi Apoſt. & quor. al. Ser. 1.

† *Hilar.* De Trinit l. 7. Affert autem pro parte fidei hujus ſignificationem ignis in ſe ignem habens, & in igne ignis manens.

plainer and ſimpler ſort of People againſt the tricks of the Hereticks, who endeavoured to ſhake their Faith by objecting to them the difficulty of its conception, which he thought fit to be helped by corporeal compariſons.

Nam cum ſit in eo ſplendor luminis, naturæ calor, virtus urendi, mobilitas æſtuandi, totum tamen ignis eſt, & hæc univerſa una natura eſt. —— Quæro itaque nunc utrum diviſio ac ſeparatio, cum ignis ex igne eſt? Aut nunquid abſcinditur natura ne maneat, aut non ſequitur ne inſit, cum accenſo Lumine ex Lumine per quendam quaſi Nativitatis profectum naturæ nulla defectio ſit, & tamen ſit lumen ex lumine? Aut nunquid hoc non manet in eo quod ex ſeſe ſine defectione ſubſiſtit. Aut hoc non ineſt in eo unde non receſſum eſt, ſed cum unitate ſubſtantiæ naturalis exivit? Et quæro an non unum ſint, cum lumen ex lumine nec diviſione ſeparabile ſit, nec genere naturæ? Et hæc ut dixi ad intelligentiam fidei tantum comparata ſunt, non etiam ad Dei dignitatem. —— Sed quia ſimpliciorum fidem furor hæreticus turbaret, ut id de Deo credi non oporteret, quod difficile niſi per corpoream comparationem poſſit intelligi.

But note, he is ſo far from the Simile of two ſeparate Candles, or Fires, or Lights, that his Diſcourſe runs altogether againſt them; and ſo in his judgment theſe ſeparate Lights are no proper, or ſafe, or congruous repreſentations, or originals for the received Light of Light.

§. 7. But here it is abſolutely neceſſary, that I examine what his Lordſhip ordered to be ſent me for his Defence in this particular. This was a paſſage in *Tertullian*'s Apolo-

Apologetick ch. 21. *Ita de Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus, ut Lumen de Lumine accenſum. Manet integra & indefecta materiæ radix; (*ſo I ſuppoſe his Lordſhip read out of Dr. *Whitby*) *etſi plures inde traduces qualitatum mutuens.* In this imperfect Segment, I will only tranſlate what is intended for this purpoſe of his Lordſhip, *viz. So* (is Chriſt or the *Verbum*) *Spirit of Spirit, and God of God, as Light kindled from Light.* Now ſuppoſing this place exactly full to his Lordſhip's deſign, I ask, is this Doctrine true or falſe, good or bad? If true and good, why is *Tertullian* ſaid among many other Fathers to have fallen into this Conceit? To fall into conceits is an expreſſion for giddineſs and error, not for Judgment and the diſcerning of great and true Myſteries. How has *Tertullian* gone beyond due bounds if this be canonical Theology? But if this Doctrine be falſe and bad, let his Lordſhip anathematize it, and the Catholick Church together, that ever owned it. But further ſuppoſing this ſtill to be the Simile of two Candles, whether good or bad; yet this is but one Author, not a Father, not every where found or conſtant to himſelf in theſe Theories, and this is but one place, which if a reproachful one, yet ought not to af-

ſect the reputation of many Fathers as frequently guilty of the ſame, except thoſe other many Fathers and their frequent uſe thereof be produced againſt them. Again, ſuppoſing ſtill this to be a Simile of fire, yet how can his Lordſhip prove that it intends two ſeparate fires; why not fire, or flame, or light in and from the ſame original fire, without diviſion or ſeparation, like the late adduced Simile of St. *Hilary*? Since what went before, and ſhall be by and by inſerted, brings the inſeparability of the *Logos*, under the repreſentation of this Simile? But after all, this is not a Simile of Candles, or common ſeparate fires, but only of the Sun and its Ray. For thus runs the whole Simile. *Etiam cum Radius ex Sole porrigitur, portio ex ſummâ, ſed Sol erit in Radio, quia ſolis eſt Radius, nec ſeparatur ſubſtantia, ſed extenditur. Ita de Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus, ſicut lumen de lumine accenſum. Manet integra & indefecta Materiæ Matrix, etſi plures inde traduces qualitatum mutueris. Ita & quod de Deo profectum eſt, Deus eſt, & Dei Filius, & unus ambo. Ita & de Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus, modulo alterum, non numero, gradu, non ſtatu fecit, & à matrice non receſſit, ſed exceſſit; iſte igitur Dei Radius, ut retro ſemper prædicabatur, delapſus*

delapſus in virginem quandam, &c. Which I will endeavour to tranſlate to the taſte of the Reader. *Even when the Ray is dilated from the Sun, it is a portion taken from the Principal, but the Sun will ſtill be in, or within the Ray, becauſe it is the Ray of the Sun, neither is his Subſtance ſeparated by the Ray, but only extended. So the Word is Spirit of Spirit, and God of God, like Light kindled from Light. The Original of the Subſtance or Matter remains entire and unimpaired, though you receive from it many derivations of qualities. So alſo that which proceeded from God, is God, and the Son of God, and both are One. So alſo he that is Spirit of Spirit, and God of God, is another from his Original by Mode, not by Number, by Order, not by Nature, and he departed not away from his Original, but only proceeded. Wherefore this Ray of God, as he was ever in paſt Ages preached, deſcending into a certain Virgin*, &c. Here the beginning enters, and the end concludes with that Simile of the Ray, (which title of the *Logos* was ever before acknowledged) and there is no other. The ſubſtance of the Simile and *Similatum* are both in themſelves undivided, and ſo parallel; the firſt *Ita* joyns the immediate conſequents to the Simile of Sun and Ray im-

mediately foregoing, and repeated in the *Lumen de Lumine accenſum*, within the ſame period, as it is, or ſhould be pointed. And all the other *Ita's* coming after with vehement elegancy look back to this Simile, with which at laſt the whole Theory is concluded in theſe words, *Iſte igitur Dei Radius.* This I think as clear as if written with the very Sun-beams. Ay! but if this *Lumen de Lumine* be not Candle of Candle, how comes *accenſum* to be uſed, which does not agree to the Emiſſion of the Sun Rays? No? What not by a Metaphor, or a light and acute Catachreſis? May not a Man ſay *Radii de Sole accenſi*, as well as *Lumen de Lumine accenſum?* Rays kindled from the Sun, as Light kindled from Light? eſpecially on this Hypotheſis, That the Sun is a Globe of fire, as to the Eye it ſeems to be? On this notion I think it proper even without a Trope. But why will not his Lordſhip allow me a Trope (if the truth needs it) in *accenſum*, who requires it for himſelf in *Lumen*? For without a Trope *Lumen* doth not ſignifie either Candle, or Fire; and if all the words muſt be taken in their Primitive intention, then his Lordſhip loſes his pretence, that this place ſpeaks of two Candles, or two Fires. But had it here really ſignified Fire, yet it does

does not hence follow, that it ſpeaks of two ſeparate Fires, ſince St. *Hilary* has found *ignem in igne*, and *lumen de lumine accenſum* in the ſame Fire. Which anſwer I ſhall give alſo, if any Man ſhall object that * of *Hippolytus*, *tanquam lumen de lumine*, & *aquam ex fonte*, *aut radium à Sole*; where the *lumen de lumine*, and the *radius à Sole* being both diſtinctly ſet with another Simile interpoſed; I take *lumen de lumine* in general to reſpect all ſorts of luminaries whatſoever, which ſend forth a coæval Ray, or ſort of flaming Light from their Original Subſtance without any diminution. So much for his Lordſhip and *Tertullian*.

* Cit. *Bullo* Defenſ. Fid. *Nicen.* p. 368.

§. 8. But there are two paſſages offered to my conſideration, that ſeem much more appoſite to his Lordſhip's purpoſe, one out of *Juſtin Martyr*, the other out of *Tatian* his Scholar, which I will exactly conſider. *Juſtin* in his Dialogue with *Trypho* had aſſerted, *that in the beginning before all Creatures God begat out of himſelf a certain rational Virtue* (*or Power*), *which is alſo called the Glory of the Lord by the Holy Spirit, and ſometimes Son, and ſometimes Wiſdom, and ſometimes Angel, and ſometimes God, and ſometimes Lord, and Word, ſome-*

times he calls himself the Captain of an Host, when he appeared in the shape of a Man to Joshua *the Son of* Nun. —— *For that he is capable of all appellations, in that he ministreth to his Father's will, and for that he was begotten by * the Will of the Father, after the manner we see a word produced in us. For when we utter a word, we beget it not by abscission or separation, so as to lessen the internal word or reason by this utterance. And as we see in Fire, that out of one Fire another is kindled without the diminution of the first Fire from whence it was kindled, this remaining the same. And that which is kindled of it also † appears to subsist not having lessened that from whence it was lighted.* Now sometime after the Father shews the reason to those *Jews*, why he so often repeated this truth; *because*, saith he, *I know that there are some willing to prevent me, and pretend that the Power that appeared from the Father of all things unto* Moses, *or to* Abraham, *or* Jacob, *is called Angel in its progression unto Men, because by it the purposes of the Father are declared unto Men. And*

* καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς θελήσει γεγεννῆσθαι, ἀνὰ τοιοῦτον ὁποῖον καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῖν γενόμενον ὁρῶμεν. *The Interpreter leaves out* ἀνὰ, *and so the consequents require.*

† ὃν φαίνεται.

And that it is called Glory, because it presents it self in an incomprehensible appearance, and Man because it appears in such [humane] shapes, as the Father will; and they call it Word, because it brings the speeches of God unto Men. They say also; that this Power is indivisible and inseparable from the Father, after the same manner as they say, the light of the Sun upon the Earth is not to be cut off, or separated from the Sun which is in Heaven, but when he sets the Light is carried off with it. So say they the Father, when he pleaseth, causeth his Power † to fly abroad, and when he listeth retracts it again to himself. After this manner also they teach that he makes Angels. But now that there are Angels always abiding, and not resolved again into that of which they were made, hath been [already] demonstrated, and withal it hath been abundantly shewn so of this power, which the Prophetick Word calls God and Angel; and that he is not as the Light of the Sun only † nominally numbred, but really is another in number, I have shewn by exquisite reason in my*

† προπηδᾶν *to leap forth.*

* καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὕτη, ἣν καὶ Θεὸν καλεῖ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος διὰ πολλῶν ὡσαύτως ἀποδέδεικται καὶ Ἄγγελον, videntur vitiosa.

† ὀνόματι ἀριθμεῖται.

my former diſcourſes in ſhort, when I ſaid this virtue was begotten by his Power and Will, not by Reſection, as if the Eſſence of the Father were divided aſunder, as all other things divided and parted, are not the ſame they were before the diviſion. And for example's ſake, I took thoſe inſtances, as we ſee from one Fire other Fires kindled, that Fire not being leſſened from whence many may be kindled, but remaining the ſame. Thus *Juſtin.* By which it appears, that theſe kind of *Pro-Sabellians* uſed the Simile of the Sun and its light to prove the *Logos* non-ſubſiſtent, no Perſon, Son, or Angel of the Father, and therefore *Juſtin* rejected that Simile, by which the Sun and its Light, and God and his *Logos* are only nominally diſtinguiſhed, and took the Simile of Fires kindled from Fires, in which there is none of that diminution, which thoſe Adverſaries object to our Doctrine of the conſubſtantiality, and both Fires ſubſiſt really after one is kindled from the other in a true diverſity. If then *Juſtin* threw off the Simile of the Sun as favouring the Hereſie after called *Sabellian*, and took that of Fires kindled from other Fires, as *Tatian* alſo uſes the Simile of Torches lighted from Torches; is it not probable

that

that our Light of Light came from theſe Similes uſed by *Juſtin* and *Tatian*, which are neither *Sabellian* as putting two ſubſiſtent ſubjects, nor *Arian* as illuſtrating the Homoouſion? In anſwer to this I need be but very ſhort, that *Juſtin* doth not ſpeak of the Eternal, Internal, and Subſtantial Emanation of the *Logos*, but of his firſt progreſſion at the Will of his Father to the Creation of all things; that this progreſſion was a kind of generation or nativity was the unanimous conception (I think) of all the Philoſophick Ancients, becauſe as here below nativity produceth the Child into light and action, that was before wrapp'd up ſecretly in the Womb quieſcent and non-apparent; ſo the *Logos* by this emiſſion from the Father to the Creation of all things did in a manner come out of the Father's σπλάγχνα (to uſe the words of *Theophilus Antiochenus*) to the publick ſight, apprehenſion, or perception of the intellectual World created by him, and acted alſo providentially in every part of the Creation. Nor was this form of Theology ever condemned in the Church, though it was not made or eſteemed matter of neceſſary Faith or Doctrine. Now the Nature of this Theory was, that

* God

* God the Father, being an Eternal Mind, had eternally in him a consubsistent reason, † which was not yet an actual word, till God thereby spake and commanded all things to be made, which was a kind of birth to him as such an actual word. That *Justin* speaks of this generation and emission is manifest in that he compares it to our utterance of words from our internal Reason, which is not diminished by that utterance, and withal asserts this generation to be not only by the Power, but the Will of God the Father, which is not proper to the Eternal Emanation. Now *Justin*'s meaning is, that this Power (called among other Terms the *Logos*) was of the Fathers substance, from which he was not divided by this progressive

* *Athenag.* Leg. Edit. *Oxon.* p. 38. ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς Νοῦς ἀΐδιος ὤν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν. *Whom yet he there calls the* πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ παρὸς, *because of his* προέλυσις *in the operation of all things. Theoph.* ad *Autolyc.* p. 81. Ἔχων οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις σπλάγχνοις ἐγέννησεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευξάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὅλων.

† *Tertull.* adv. *Praxeam.* Ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, ipse sibi & mundus, & locus, & omnia. Solus autem, quia nihil extrinsecus præter eum. Cæterum ne tunc quidem solus: habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso, rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis enim Deus, & Ratio in ipso prius, & ita ab ipso omnia. Quæ ratio sensus ipsius est. Hanc Græci Λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermo-

ſive emiſſion or nativity, and that after this progreſſion into the World from the Father he has ſubſiſted in making ſeveral appearances in it, being never called back from the World again, as the Rays of the Sun are upon the ſetting, but remaining and ſubſiſting in the World as a Fire does that is kindled from another, being not drawn back again into that from whence it was kindled. This appears further to be his Senſe from the like Doctrine of *Tatian*,* who after he had taught that God the Father had before the Creation the *Logos* ſubſiſtent in him, at length thus ſpeaks; *By the Will of God's ſimplicity the* Logos προπηδᾷ *goes forth, and going forth not in vain* [διὰ κενῆς per vacuum] *he becomes the firſt*

* Con. Gent.

nem appellamus. Ideoq; jam in uſu eſt noſtrorum per ſimplicitatem interpretationis Sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuiſſe, cum magis rationem competat antiquiorem haberi; quia non Sermonalis à Principio, ſed rationalis Deus etiam ante Principium. Et quia ipſe quoque Sermo ratione conſiſtens priorem eam ut ſubſtantiam ſuam oſtendat. Tamen & ſic nihil intereſt. Nam etſi Deus nondum ſermonem ſuum miſerat, proinde eum cum ipſa & in ipsâ ratione intrà ſemetipſum habebat tacitè cogitando, & diſponendo ſecum quæ per Sermonem monerat dicturus. Cum ratione enim ſua cogitans atque diſponens Sermonem eam efficiebat quam Sermone tractabat. ——Vide cum tacitus tecum ipſe congrederis, ratione hoc ipſum agi intra te occurrente ea tibi cum ſermone ad omnem cogitatus tui motum, & ad

born

omnem ſenſus tui pulſum. Quodcunq; cogitaveris ſermo eſt, quodcunque ſenſeris ratio eſt. Loquaris illud in animo neceſſe eſt, & dum loqueris, conlocutorem pateris ſermonem in quo ineſt hæc ipſa ratio, qua cum eo cogitans loquaris, per quem loquens cogitas. — Quanto ergo plenius hoc agitur in Deo, cujus tu quoque imago & ſimilitudo cenſeris, quod habeat in ſe etiam tacendo rationem, & in ratione ſermonem: Poſſum itaq; non temere præſtruxiſſe, & tunc Deum ante univerſitatis conſtitutionem ſolum non fuiſſe habentem in ſemetipſo proinde rationem, & in ratione ſermonem, quem ſecundum à ſe faceret agitando inter ſe. Hæc vis & hæc divini ſenſus diſpoſitio apud Scripturas etiam in Sophiæ nomine oſtenditur. Quid enim ſapientius ratione Dei ſive ſermone? Itaq; Sophiam quoque exaudi ut ſecundam perſonam conditam, Dominus creavit me initium viarum ſuarum. Nam ut primum Deus voluit ea quæ eum ratione & ſermone diſpoſuerat intra ſe, in ſubſtantias & ſpecies ſuas edere, ipſum primum protulit ſermonem, habentem in ſe individuas ſuas rationes Sophiam, ut per ipſum fierent univerſa per quem erant cogitata atque diſpoſita, imo

born production [προβολὴν] *of the Spirit. But thus he became by* [μεριστὸν] *communication, not abſciſſion. For that which is cut off is ſeparated from its firſt original, but that which is Communicated* [μεριζόμενον] *being endowed with its proper function, did not leave him from whence it was taken void of the* Logos. *For as many Fires are kindled from one Torch, and the light of the firſt Torch is not diminiſhed through the kindling of many Torches: So alſo the going forth out of the power of his Father did not render his Father void of Reaſon, or without the* Logos. So all the

diſcourſe

& facta jam quantum in Dei ſenſu. — Tunc igitur ipſe ſermo ſpeciem & ornatum ſuum ſumit, ſonum & vocem cum dicit Deus, fiat Lux. Hæc eſt nativitas perfecta ſermonis, dum ex Deo procedit, conditus ab eo primum ad cogitatum in nomine Sophiæ, Dominus condidit me initium viarum; dehinc generatus ad effectum: Cum pararet cœlum aderam illi: Exinde eum parem ſibi faciens de quo procedendo filius factus eſt, primogenitus ut ante omnia genitus, & unigenitus ut ſolus ex Deo genitus. Vide plura ibid.

diſcourſe is about the προφορικὸς, which *Juſtin* and *Tatian* both make a kind of nativity or production, and the Simile is applied only thereto, not the eternal Emanation of its ſubſiſtence from the Father. Now the *Nicene* Creed in this form Light of Light, hath reſpect to the Original of the Eſſential and Eternal Subſiſtence of the *Logos*, to wit, whence he is what he is, that is, God and Light, and defines that he is God of God, and Light of Light eſſentially, not mentioning his Office in the Creation, till after other interpoſed Articles of his Being and Subſiſtence. And for the truth of this ſenſe in the *Nicene* Creed, I appeal to the ſuffrage of all Antiquity. So then theſe places of *Juſtin* and *Tatian* touching only the proſiliency of the Son from the Father to create all things, by which the Co-eternal Wiſdom had a kind of probletick nativity of an actual Word, pertain not to the matter of this Light of Light in the *Nicene* form. But doth not

Juſtin

Justin say, that the Sun and its Ray are not two really, but only nominally? I grant he does so, but this in concession to the pertinacy of the Opponents, who obstinately urged this, that the Light of the Sun is ἀνυπόστατον an unsubsistent virtue, and so the *Logos* likewise: Not that otherwise *Justin* would have waved the Simile of the Sun and his Rays, which had its Authority in the Scriptures; to satisfie therefore the perverters of a Simile otherwise good did *Justin* wave it, and chose that of Fires. And yet what is it that *Justin* illustrates thereby? Not the manner how the *Logos* eternally issues from and subsists in his Father, no, nor the manner of this prosiliency to the Creation, but only the non-diminution of the Father by this prosiliency, or non-separation of substance therein, and the substantial permanency of the *Logos* in the World, after this prosiliency, without revocation out of it back again: Whereas his Lordship fixes his Figures of Candles on the conceits of the Fathers, concerning the fœcundity in the Divine Essence, and the essential Eductions of the two last from the first. So then these places give no colour to that *Opprobrium*. But though this be a full answer, yet will I *ex abundanti* adventure further

further to consider the Antiquity of the Simile of the Sun Rays, and how it came to be perverted by *Justin*'s Adversaries, and therefore waved by him. It is evident therefore, that though *Justin* greatly admired the Platonick Philosophy before he turned Christian; yet after that he admired the Theology taught in the Church by Theories received from the Scriptures, in which also the better part of the *Jews* agreed. Now it is certain that * *Solomon*'s *Proverbs* and the † Theories thereupon in the Apocryphal Books of the Wisdom of *Solomon* ‡ and *Ecclesiasticus* teach the Deity, Consubstantiality, Generation, and this Progression of the Divine Wisdom. And by the *Jewish* Author of the Wisdom of *Solomon* * he is called ἀπαύγασμα, that is, Ray of the everlasting Light, and according to that *Hebrew* Notion the Divine Author † to the *Hebrews* calls Christ the ἀπαύγασμα of the Father's Glory. So then it seems hence, that the Ancient pious *Jews* looked on the Wisdom of God, as a Personal Companion with God, issuing from him as a Ray from the glorious Lu-

* *Prov.* 8. 22, &c.

† Sap. Sal. c. 7. c. 8. c. 9. c. 11. c. 12.

‡ *Eccl.* c. 1. c. 24.

* Ch. 7. 26.

† *Hebr.* 1. 3.

minary the Sun. This Wisdom, as by it God spake and commanded the Creation of all things, or as being that Archetypal Reason whence the World was formed, was called by the Hellenist *Jews Logos*, and was looked on as a Son, a Personal Minister and Angel of God in the Creation, Providence, and Revelations. This being then their celebrated and traditional Theology, the next Curiosity was to enquire into his generation and descent. And here no wonder if that of *Esaias* 53. 8. most agreeably quadrated to the *Jewish* ignorance, *Who shall declare his generation?* Yet for this they go back to their great Master *Moses*, who declared that God spake the Fiat of all things, and therein therefore they conceive a certain Production and Genesis of their *Logos*, his internal conception being the geniture, and its emission into its effects its nativity, after the manner that our Notions are conceived and offered in our voice. And this I believe is that which † *Philo* meant, that God did voluntarily prefigure in himself the Archetypal World, which is his *Logos*, after the manner of all Artificers that propose

* *Philo* de Mund. Opific. προλαβὼν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἄτε Θεὸς, ὅτι μίμημα καλὸν, οὐκ ἂν πότε γένοιτο καλῶ δίχα παραδείγματος· οὐδέ τι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀνυπαίτιον ὁ μὴ πρὸς ἀρ-

pose Schemes to themselves according to which they perform their external works. For as *Philo* does not say that God made or created, but only prefigured in himself the archetypal World; so by that he only means, that of all the *Ideas* in the Divine Mind, of which consists the Eternal Reason and Wisdom of God, God chose that of this World to be the pattern of what he would create by it, and according to it. For one cannot think, that so great a Man as *Philo* should think, that ever there was any imaginable point or time, when God's essential reason was not, or was without the *Idea's* of all things possible. I take it therefore, that the Eternal Reason, which with all other possible *Idea's*, eternally had in it the *Idea* of such a World (as ours is) possible, is by *Philo* conceived to be in this *Idea* designed by God, for an actual pattern and principle also of this future World, and so in this

χέτυπον καὶ νοητὴν ἰδέαν ἀπεικονίσθη βουληθεὶς τὸν ὁρατὸν τουτονὶ κόσμον δημιεργῆσαι, προεξετύπου τὸν νοητὸν ἵνα χρώμενος ἀσωμάτῳ καὶ θεοειδεστάτῳ παραδείγματι τὸν σωματικὸν ἀπεργάσεται προσβυτέρου νεώτερον ἀπεικόνισμα —— τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον οὐδ' ὁ ἐκ τῶν ἰδεῶν κόσμος ἄλλον οὐκ ἂν εἶχε τόπον ἢ τὸν θεῖον λόγον τὸν ταῦτα διακοσμήσαντα, δῆλον δὲ ὅτι ἡ ἀρχέτυπος σφραγὶς ὃν φαμὲν ἐστὶ κόσμον νοητὸν, αὐτὸς ἂν εἴη τὸ ἀρχέτυπον παράδειγμα, ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν, ὁ Θεοῦ λόγος & antea οὐδὲν ἂν ἕτερον εἴποι τὸν νοητὸν ἐστὶ κόσμον ἢ Θεοῦ λόγον ἤδη κοσμοποιοῦντος.

Respect the *Logos* and first begotten Son of God. And from this *Jewish* fountain proceed the like Notions in the Platonick Theology. Now hereupon *Justin* disputing with *Jews*, does in the first citation above made argue with them upon the Theology of their Fathers * declared by *Philo*, to whose very words he seems to have had an especial respect, if you but compare them. But now the *Sadduces*, that had not Religion enough to believe any Angels or noetick Beings, denied all this, and to evade the force of *Moses* his Testimonies (whose Books only they admitted) they grant indeed † that the Power of God appeared to the Fathers, and was called Angel, as delivering God's Will; but not as really a subsistent Spirit, but only an agitated Virtue. And I indeed am of opinion, that after Christianity, and our Doctrines of Christ as the Divine

* *Philo.* de Confus. Dialect. Σπόδαζε κοσμεῖσθαι κατ' τὸ πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα καὶ γὰρ Ἀρχὴ, καὶ ὄνομα Θεοῦ, καὶ λόγος, καὶ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὁρῶν Ἰσραὴλ προσαγορεύεται. —— Θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος. & ad verb. *Zach.* 6. 12. ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ᾧ ὄνομα Ἀνατολή. Καινοτάτη πρόσρησις, ἐάν γε τὸν ἀσώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστῶτα λέγεσθαι νομίσης· ἐὰν δὲ τὸν ἀσώματον ἐκεῖνον θεῖαν ἰδέαν φοροῦντα, ἱκανῶς ὁμολογήσεις ὅτι εὐθυβολώτατον ὄνομα ἐπεφημίσθη τὸ Ἀνατολὴ αὐτῷ. Vid. Euseb. Præp. Evan. l. 11. c. 15.

† *Calv.* Instit. l. 1. c. 14. S. 9.

Logos

Logos increaſed, the *Jews* quitted their former Theology of the *Logos* ſo far, as herein to admit *Sadduciſm*, and to deny his Sonſhip, Perſonality, and Angelical Miniſtration to his Father. And as *Trypho* himſelf looks on the pre-exiſtence of the Meſſias, as the Divine *Logos*, to be an incredible Paradox; ſo thoſe others that *Juſtin* ſays were willing to pre-occupate him with thoſe Anſwers which he there recites and refutes, ſeem to be perfect *Sadduces* in this Point of the *Logos*, and all Angels; and thoſe ſome of *Trypho*'s Company. But whether they were *Jewiſh Sadduces*, or ſome Hereticks of a pretended Chriſtian Character; it is plain they uſed the old Traditional Simile of the ἀπαύγασμα or light of the Sun, on purpoſe to deſtroy the Traditions of Angels, and conſequently the Perſonality and Office of the *Logos*. Thus ſay they, our Tradition repreſents the Powers apparent, as mere ἀπαυγάσματα, mere imperſonal unſubſiſtent rays, that abide no longer than their Office, but return again to their original preſently after, as the light goes off when the Sun ſets. So all this put together proves, that the Simile of the ἀπαύγασμα was uſed in the old Traditional Theology of the *Jews*, and continued among *Chriſtians*, but was

perverted by *Sadduces*, especially since Christianity, to oppose our other Theological Theories; and therefore *Justin* waved it to avoid the wrangles of those *Jews* he then dealt with. And hence, notwithstanding all such *Jews* or *Sadduceans*, the Christian Church still ever kept this Simile, and always alledged it to the explication of the *Nicene* form, without fear of being impeached of *Sabellianism*. But as for *Justin*'s Simile of several Fires, and *Tatian*'s several Torches, though the invaluable Dr. *Bull* (ὁ θεολόγων θεολογικώτατος) hereby well shews, that these Ancients held the Homoousion, yet * he confesses *Tatian*'s Simile (which is the same with *Justin*'s) to be lame, and such as he will not make out, and so with this note I conclude this long disquisition.

* *Bull* Defen. Fid. *Nic.* p. 357. Similia autem, quæ post ea quæ huc usque explicavimus, adbibet *Tatianus*, ad mysterium, sive æternæ productionis, sive τῆς προπηδήσεως τοῦ λόγου, utcunq; illustrandum, nolo omnino præstare, &c.

§. 9. But before we leave this our form of Faith, it may not be amiss to find it out a better Original. Now the Glorious purity of the Divine Essence is such, that for it we have no adequate conception, and therefore we are forced to celebrate it by names of the greatest Glories and Purities, which

which we know, and which ſeem by the intention of God in Nature to be Symbols of it. And of all theſe the moſt Excellent is Light. This in General St. *Paul* * excellently defines, that † *whatſoever doth make manifeſt is Light*, according to the *Greek* derivation of the Word. And accordingly the *Urim* in the Pontifick Pectoral is by the Septuagint rendred Δήλωσις. So that that which is moſt excellently manifeſtative, that is the moſt perfect and true Light. Of theſe there muſt be two ſorts according to the two great parts of the *Mundane* Syſtem, *i.e.* intellectual and corporeal, and of theſe the intellectual are really the nobler, and of theſe the manifeſtative Light of the Deity muſt be the trueſt and higheſt of all, upon which no *Manichean* darkneſs can border. Hence St. *John* ſaith, that * *God is light, and in him is no darkneſs at all*, which is originally true of God the Father, and as really true of the Son and Holy Spirit. For of the Son the ſame St. *John* ſaith, † *That he is the true Light that Lighteth every Man that cometh into the World*; and if true, then not Parabolical or Metaphorical Only. So that as the Scriptures teach the

* *Eph.* 5. 13.

† φῶς ἀ φάν inde φαίνω, &c.

* 1 *Joh.* 1. 5.

† *Joh.* 1. 9.

Father to be originally God, and the Son really God of God the Father, ſo when they teach God the Father to be true original Light, and the Son to be true Light alſo, by immediate conſequence they teach the Son to be true Light of Light Original, like that Text which the Fathers apply to this purpoſe; *In thy Light ſhall we ſee Light.* So that our Light of Light is not the product of a Simile in two Candles, but a literal truth revealed in the Scriptures, and thence as truly taken as God of God. And we may as well deny the reality and truth of the Life of God, deny him to be the living God, though he himſelf ſwears by that Life, and atteſts the truth of it, as to deny that he is true Light, which is expreſly aſſerted of the Father, and the Son. Now the Son being what he is from the Father, here is literal Scripture for Light of Light, Light indeed inacceſſible, yet Light true and eſſential. And from hence I dare deduce the *Nicene* form, inſtead of that Chandlers Shop, whence his Lordſhip's fancy had its illumination. Here then will I fix his Lordſhip in this Queſtion; Whether the *Logos* the Son of God be really what the Scripture calls him true Light, and Life? If not, I yield the Argument, but at his Lordſhip's peril.

peril. But if he really be, then the Creed is true without a Metaphor from Divine Revelation, not from humane conceits and adumbrations. As for the ἀπαύγασμα, I grant it a term metaphorical, but that is not in the Creed, perhaps, becauſe a Simile, and the ſame like all Similes, below the dignity of the Hypoſtaſis repreſented thereby; but however this is nothing to his Lordſhip's pretty Simile, that he found out for the good old Faith and Fathers; but the Light of Light is as literally true, as any thing ſpoken of God can be, or is in Holy Scripture.

§. 10. But ſuppoſing many Fathers had borrowed their dim light from theſe Candles, yet it ſeems it led them like an *Ignis fatuus* into ſtrange brakes, if, as his † Lordſhip taxes them, *in this way of explaining this matter they have ſaid many things, which intimate that they believed an inequality between the Perſons, and a ſubordination of the ſecond and third to the firſt.* That the Fathers do teach a Perſonal Gradation or Subordination in the Deity I grant, and for the account hereof, I referr to Dr. *Bull*'s fourth Section of his Great Monument of the Faith. But had theſe Fathers fallen into the conceit of this Simile of Souls propagated from Souls, or Candles

† P. 31.

Candles lighted from Candles, I cannot ſee how they could have bended it to aſſimilate ſuch, or any Subordination. For there is none ſuch between Souls propagated from Souls, or Candles lighted from Candles, though there be ſucceſſion of time. Beſide Inequality and Subordination either Reſpects, Eſſences, or Perſons, and his Lordſhip ought to have named the particular ſort, leaſt his Reader ſhould be apt to miſtake, that theſe Fathers held an eſſential Inequality and Subordination, as many Hereſies did, and the terms to common Ears will ſeem to import; but this he leaves undetermined, that we may not ſee him in the dark. Beſides, even in the Perſonal Subordination his Lordſhip ought to have been clear, that it ſignifies no proper Inferiority or Subjection, ſuch as is between ſupreme and inferiour Authorities among Men, the plenitude of the Higheſt not being imparted to the Subject Governour, which no Fathers aſſert in the Trinity; and yet the terms of Inequality and Perſonal Subordination ſimply ſet without an explanatory guard will to common ſenſes ſuggeſt this wrong Notion as the Senſe of the Fathers, though their Subordination is explicitely no other, but what conſiſts in the order of Emanations, and the Operations

tions *ad extra* accordingly, the Father originally working all things by the *Logos* and the Holy Spirit, who therefore were commonly called * Ministers and Officers to the Father, till Hereticks took up their Words and Authorities for a Cavil to a greater degradation than ever was intended or would have been endured by those Fathers. Wherefore his Lordship is obliged by all Laws of integrity to shew the exorbitancy of this Subordination which they all own, or if not, to prove that these Ancient Souls and Candlesticks propagated the Doctrine of any other Subordination, which I dare undertake he can never do, but without doing it must incurr the guilt of defaming the Innocent that are now with God.

* Διάκονοι, ὑπηρέται, λειτουργοί.

§. 11. But yet it seems ill-luck would have it, that these subordinating Fathers in the very career of their exorbitant Subordination, fell into such Notions of the Homoousion, which overturn their own dear Subordination, † *So that by the same Substance or Essence they do in many places express themselves, as if they only meant the same being in a general sense, as all Humane Souls are of the same Substance, that is, the same Order, or sort of*

† P. 31.

of Beings, and they seemed to entitle them to different Operations, not only in an Oeconomical way, but thought that the one did that which the other did not. Now supposing this had been true, how could they at the same time have fallen into the subordinating Heresie? For this Heresie is at least Arian, grounding the Subordination of Dignity on Inequality of Essence; but all Humane Souls are essentially equal as are all individuals of the same Species, however entitled to different Operations. But in truth his Lordship falsly charges them with a mere specifick Homoousion in the Trinity. I own they bring it for illustration so far, that as separate individuals of the same kind are called ὁμοούσια, and thereby is implied an equality of Essence, * so the same word used in the Godhead of the Father and the Son, excludes that essential inequality of the *Arians*, which his Lordship would yet trump upon these very Fathers. But then the Fathers teach a proper originary Homoousion, by which the Father communicates his own

* *Dionys. Alexand.* ap. *Athan.* de *Syn. Nic.* con. *Arian.* Decret. καὶ γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνην γονὴν παρεθέμην, δῆλον ὡς ὅσαι ὁμοουσιῶν, φήσας πάντας τοὺς γονεῖς μόνον ἑτέρους εἶναι τῶν τέκνων. ὅτι μὴ αὐτοὶ εἶεν τὰ τέκνα· — οἶδα δὲ καὶ μέμνημαι πλείονα προσθεὶς τῶν συγγενῶν ὁμοιώματα. — *Athan.* de commun. Essent. Pat. & Fil. & Spir.

own Subſtance to the Son, and thereupon the τὸ ἀμέριστον, ἀχώριστον, ἄτμητον, and ἀδιαίρετον, the eſſential inſeparability of theſe Perſons in the Godhead, which a mere ſpecifick Homoouſion will not reach to. But thus the argument runs ſtrongly againſt the Hereticks; If Fathers, Sons, and Kinſmen be ὁμοούσιοι, as being of the ſame nature, and deſcended from the ſame loins, if more looſely all things of the ſame kind are ὁμοούσια and ὁμοφυῆ, though ſeparate and much differing in ſhape, humors, and actions one from another, how much more are the Father and the Son ὁμοούσιοι in the Divine Nature, that are in all reſpects undivided, and without any diſſimilitude or inequality? But, though this be the ſtrongeſt way of arguing againſt Hereticks, from the ſpecifick Homoouſion to the individual, by ſhewing that the term in general admits different

Sti. ὁ γὰρ Μανὴς φιλοῖς ὅτι πάντων τὸ βυθιδίτικον μία ἔχει ἡ φύσις, καὶ ἀεὶ τὸ ἔκγονον, καὶ ἀεὶ τὸ ἀνδρῶν γένος ——— ἔκγονον καὶ ἀνάλογον τῶν ἐρίφων εἰς διάλεκτον τὰ πλάδη τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκάλεσεν ἵνα ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὰ πλάδη τῶν ἐκγόνων ἐκάλεσεν ἔκγονον ἵνα δηλῶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς φύσεως· εἰ οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὄντα συμφυῆ τὴν φύσιν ὄντα διάφορα τὰ μορφῆς, καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ βουλῆς —— καὶ διάφορα γλῶτται· διὰ καὶ ἀνθρώποι μέγα λέγω· πόσῳ μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως πᾶσα ἡ ὁμοίωσις εἰς ἄνθρωπον ἐκλήθη ὅτι ἡ ἀμέρεια καὶ ἡ ἀξία, μία βασιλεία, μία δύναμις, καὶ βουλὴ, καὶ ἐνέργεια (against his Lordſhips different Operations) ἰδιάζουσα τῶν Τεσσάρων ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως, ἵνα λέγω Θεόν——

different Modes or Degrees of coessentiality or connaturality, of which the individual is the greatest and exactest in the Trinity; yet even simply the term it self in its utmost generality, and without restriction will by consequence inferr a co-eternity in the Persons. Let the Term therefore open to the loosest Importance, let it be fansied that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are Three Persons of one common Kind diversly acting in themselves; yet even this Notion will hold them to be equally of an Eternal and Divine Essence, which was strong against *Arians*, *Photinians*, and *Macedonians*; but it not being so clear against *Tritheism*, therefore all the Fathers asserted the τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, and the origination of the Son, and Holy Spirit, inseparably in the Father on purpose to disclaim and silence those charges of *Tritheism*, which yet his Lordship does not blush to fix on them (in words to be considered immediately) notwithstanding their expres remonstrances and demonstrations to the contrary. And yet after all, supposing that the cavils of the Hereticks had forced the Fathers into such forms of argumentation, as might then appear expedient and good *ad hominem*, which now in an Age of other apprehensions seem not so,

these

theſe are not to be ſtretched by us to reproachful and unintended Conſequences, of which the Church in thoſe Ages knew them to be innocent, and therefore gloried in their Piety. But, as to the diverſity of Operations, with which his Lordſhip twits them, whatſoever forms may drop from them in popular or homiletical diſcourſes (in which no Men take ſo much care to be critical as affective) I believe his Lordſhip can produce no Divine Operations *ad extra* ſo applied to one Perſon, as poſitively to exclude all concurrence in the others. For I wot not that they oppoſe St. *Paul*'s *Doctrine, * 1 Cor. 12. 6.

that *there are diverſities of Operations, but the ſame God which worketh all in all.*

§. 12. And yet we find his Lordſhip † falling into that very † P. 42.

guilt with which he upbraids the Fathers, by framing worſe Similes, (as ſhall appear in due place) and from them framing a Theological conceit, that *in the Divine Eſſence, which is the ſimpleſt and perfecteſt Unity, there may be Three, that may have a diverſity of Operations, as well as Oeconomies.* Here his Lordſhip did not much remember St. *Paul* above-cited, nor himſelf in his 31. page on which we now are. But whether this may be ſo, or not ſo, God knows,

knows, it follows not from the Simile of a compounded Nature, operating diverſly from Principles, Parts, and Virtues ſpecifically and naturally oppoſite, which in his Lordſhip's expreſſion, *may be brought to the Terms of a Contradiction*, of which, I ſuppoſe, there is no capacity in the moſt ſimple Nature of the Deity.

§. 13. But let us ſee the foul aſpect of the Homoouſion in the Writings of theſe Fathers, and what Reformation followed thereupon. *This was*, ſaith his Lordſhip, * *more eaſily apprehended, but it ſeemed ſo directly to aſſert three Gods, which was very contrary to many moſt expreſs declarations both in the Old and New Teſtament, in which the Unity of the Deity is ſo often held forth, that therefore others took another way of explaining this, making it their foundation, that the Deity was one numerical Being.* In this Reflexion here are two things, which in his Lordſhip's judgment (and he ſays the judgment of the after Ancients) ſeem directly to aſſert three Gods, *viz.* their Arguments from a ſpecifick Homoouſion, and their aſcribing divers Operations. The *Jews* and *Greeks* of old charged us * with *Polytheiſm*, on the account of our Trinity, and his Lordſhip

* P. 31.

* *Athan.* con. *Arian.* Orat 4.

Lordſhip here ſeems to juſtifie and ſecond the Infidels in that Charge againſt all the Fathers, who argued from the ſpecifick Homoouſion, and diſtinct Operations, which I think were well nigh all the *Greek* Fathers, after the *Nicene* Council, even *Athanaſius*, who thus * argues, and yet diſſolves the Crime of *Polytheiſm*, which his Lordſhip with *Jews* and *Heathens* lays upon them, but from which I have clear'd them alſo §. 11. But if divers Operations as well as the Arguments from a ſpecifick Homouſion ſeem directly to aſſert three Gods; how came his Lordſhip to grant ſuch a conception allowable, that *there may be three, that may have a diverſity of Operations as well as Oeconomies?* For if he be no Tritheiſt in allowing this Conception, why does he reflect on it as Tritheite in the Fathers? And yet his Lordſhip diverſifies the Operations much more excluſively (each of other Perſon) than any Fathers do, and in ſuch a manner as inferrs a Tetrad in the Deity, in which according to his Lordſhip the Father muſt be a ſecond Principle. For his words run thus; † *In the Divine Eſſence, which is the ſimpleſt and perfecteſt Unity, there may be three, that may have a diverſity of Operations, as well*

* Ubi ſup.

† P. 42.

as Oeconomies. By the first God may be supposed to have made and to govern all things, by the second to have actuated and been most perfectly united to the Humanity of Christ, and by the third to have inspired the Penmen of the Scriptures, and the Workers of Miracles, and still to renew and purifie all good Minds; all which notwithstanding we firmly believe there is but one God. Now whatsoever acts by another is distinct from that other by which it acts, and prior in the Agency by the order of Reason. If then God acts by the first, which is the Father, that God is in Nature and Subsistence antecedent to the Father, and the first hath a former; and if God who acts by three be distinct from those three by which he acts, there are then four Distincts and Distinctions in the Deity, or else the three are not essential in the Deity, but only operant and unsubstantial Powers and Qualities. Yet is it against Faith to say that God acts or creates by the Father, because it makes him secondary by an unallowable conception, the Canonical Faith herein being that God original, or God the Father acts by his Son and Holy Spirit. But whether we make the Father primary or secundary, if we attribute the Creation to him exclusively of the *Logos* and Holy Spirit,

Spirit, and the Inſpirations to the Spirit excluſively of the Father and the Son, and the Divine Operations in the Union of our Nature, with the *Logos* to the *Logos*, only excluſively of the Father and Holy Spirit, according to his Lordſhip's ſcheme of conceptions, we rove from truth, from Scripture, from Catholick Tradition, which aſcribes theſe to the ſingle Perſons by a peculiar reſpect of Oeconomick Order, but not by an excluſive propriety of Operation. And, yet, though his Lordſhip recommends this conception, of ſuch a ſeparate Agency in his three Divine Anonymities, yet can he find no ſuch incongruities in the received Doctrines of thoſe his deſpiſed Fathers. But 'tis time to take breath, and conſider what reformation following extinguiſhed this *Tritheiſm* in the Catholick Church and Faith. Why, *Others* therefore *laid another foundation in one numerical Deity or Being*. Now what is this, but to inſinuate, nay, openly to aſſert that the former Fathers, that believed Emanations and Fœcundity, and argued from the ſpecifick Homoouſion, with the reſpective Operations, did not fundamentally own one individual Deity? And yet how could they that ſtuck to the *Nicene* Creed, deny the fundamental Article of one God, which

yet all the taxed Fathers defended as the Faith of all the former Fathers, who made the Monarchy a fundamental Principle against *Gentilism*, and were herein exactly and professedly followed by all their Successors? Nay, the feature of his Lordship's reflexion seems to attaint all Antiquity of *Tritheism*, till after the Doctors of the specifick Homoousion and distinct Operations ceased, as not holding the Unity of the Godhead; for his conjunction *therefore* makes this Unity a *post-nate* Principle, taken up upon the apprehension that the former Doctrines of the Church were *Tritheite*, according to his Lordship's general Imputation.

§. 14. And now it seems high time to observe upon what fancies (for they are represented as such) these *Tritheite* Principles were reformed by these over-*seri patrum nepotes*. * They then *observed, that the Sun besides its own Globe had an Emanation of Light, and another of Heat, which had different Operations, and all from the same Essence. And that the Soul of Man had both Intellection and Love, which flowed from its Essence. So they conceived that the Primary Act of the Divine Essence was its Wisdom, by which it saw all things, and in which as in*

† P. 32.

an

an Eternal Word it deſigned all things. This they thought might be called the Son, as being the generation of the Eternal Mind, while from the fountain Principle, together with the inward Word, there did ariſe a Love that was to iſſue forth, and that was to be the Soul of the Creation, and was more particularly to animate the Church, and in this Love all things were to have life and favour. This was reſted on, and was afterwards dreſſed up with a great deal of dark nicety by the Schools, and grew to be the univerſally received explanation. So that it ſeems theſe conceptions, theſe reforming conceptions, are very novel, and the Doctrine derived from them became not univerſal, but by the Definitions of the Schools.

§. 15. But before we come to juſtifie their due Antiquity, let us conſider whether, as his Lordſhip repreſents them, the *Tritheiſm* of the former Fathers were really amended by them. For in this Simile here are two Emanations from the Globe of the Sun, Light and Heat, which have different Operations, which if they repreſent different Operations of the different Perſons in the Deity, this reduces that *Tritheiſm* which the Simile was deſigned to avoid. So unhappy were theſe Theologi-

cal Tinkers in mending the former Theories.

§. 16. But however, let us ſee whether theſe Theories had not really a more early Original and Reception in the Univerſal Church. I begin with the Simile of the Sun; † Now *Tertullian* the moſt ancient of all our Latin Writers uſed this Simile, and ſays, that in reſpect thereof the *Logos* was ever backward celebrated under this Title as the Ray of God. So * *Lactantius* had learned the ſame Simile from *Tertullian*, or his Church. So † St. *Auſtin* (an *African* likewiſe) had from his Fathers derived the ſame Example of the Sun. The Greek Fathers that lived in and juſt after the *Nicene* Council ſo often, ſo uniformly, and canonically uſe it (who yet argued from the ſpecifick Senſe of the Homoouſion) that the citations of them would fill a Volume; ſo this Fancy is not later than theſe Tritheit Homoouſiaſts. And to let his Lordſhip ſee, that it was an *Ante-Nicene* Simile, not only the Scripture term ἀπαύγασμα may convince,

† Apolog c. 21. ſup. citat §. 7. Vide.

* Inſtit. l. 4. c. 29. ille tanquam Sol, hic quaſi radius à Sole porrectus.

† In Evan. *Joh.* c. 5. Tract. 20. Si ſeparas candorem Solis à Sole, ſepara Verbum à Patre.

vince, but the expreſs production of it * by *Theognoſtus*, who ſtill maintains the Old *Jewiſh* and Primitive Simile againſt all *Sadducean* and *Sabellian* perverſions of it, ſuch as we above ſaw practiſed by the Adverſaries of this truth in the days of *Juſtin Martyr*. See above §. 8.

* *Theognoſt.* ap. *Athan.* de Syn. Nic. con. *Arian.* Decret. Οὐκ ἐξωδίνησε τὸν ὄζον ἐξ ἀρρενείου ἢ τῆς ὑπ' οὐσίαν — ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας, ὡς τῆς φωτὸς ἀπαύγασμα, ὡς ὕδατος ἀτμὶς· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, ἔστι καὶ ἀτμὶς αὐτὸ τὸ ὕδωρ ὄζειν, ἢ αὐτὸς ὁ ἥλιος, ἔστι ἀφῤῥῆσιν, ἀλλ' ἀπόῤῥοια τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας, ἀμερισμὸν ὑπομενούσης τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας· ὡς γὰρ μίανον ὁ ἥλιος καὶ μερῶν τὴν ἐκχυμιζόμενος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ αὐγαῖς· ὅπως οὖν καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἀφηίσιν ὑπέμεινεν εἰκόνα ἔαυτῆς ἔχουσα τὸν υἱόν.

§ 17. Secondly the Antiquity of the Simile taken from our Minds admits ſo large a Vindication, that to quote † ſayings at large would make a little compendious Library of the Fathers, and therefore to avoid a bulk, I muſt referr to a few Authors and Authorities in the Margin, that are confeſſedly of a much greater antiquity than his Lordſhip aſſigns to the invention or uſe of this Simile, who

† *Arm. Alex. Protrep. Tertull.* adv. *Prax. Theoph.* ad *Autolyc. Orig.* con. *Celſ.* l. 7. & de Princip. l. 1. c. 2. *Euſeb.* con. *Marcell.* l. 2. c. 17. *Athan.* Syn. Nic. con. Hær. *Arian.* Decret. & con. *Arian.* Orat. 2. Orat. 3. Orat. 4. & con. Gent. *Greg. Nyſſ.* de hom. Opific. c. 5. *Greg. Naz.* Irenic. 2. *Ambroſ.* de dignit. human. condit. *Aug.* in Evan. *Joh.* Tract. c. 1.

yet reſemble the Theology of the Trinity by the image thereof in our Minds, which the Scriptures affirming to be created after the Image, and in the Likeneſs of God, recommended to thoſe Fathers, and us to learn Theories of God by thoſe glances of his Divinity, with which he has both adorned and enlightened our intellectual Powers, from thoſe inſpired ſtrains of Theology, that ſo expreſly ſuit with that *Idea* we have of our own internal Principles.

§. 18. But now let us further try, whether his Lordſhip, * that flouts the Fathers for their many impertinent Similes, does not pretend to ſupply us with others in our own Nature, which really are much more impertinent to the conception of the Trinity. *We do plainly perceive*, † ſaith he, *in our ſelves two, if not three Principles of Operation, that do not only differ as Underſtanding and Will, which are only different Modes of thinking, but differ in their Character and way of Operation. All our cogitations and reaſonings are a ſort of Acts, in which we can reflect on the way how we operate. We perceive that we act freely in them, and that we turn our Minds to ſuch objects and thoughts as we pleaſe. But by another Principle, of which we perceive nothing,*

* P. 32.

† P. 41, 42.

nothing, and can reflect upon no part of it, we live in our Bodies, we animate and actuate them, we receive ſenſations from them, and give motions to them, we live and dye, and do not know how all this is done. It ſeems to be from ſome Emanation from our Souls, in which we do not feel that we have any liberty, and ſo we muſt conclude, that this Principle in us is natural and neceſſary. In acts of Memory, Imagination, and Diſcourſe, there ſeems to be a mixture of both Principles, or a third that reſults out of them. For we feel a freedom in one reſpect, but as for thoſe marks that are in our brain, that ſet things in our memory, or furniſh us with words, we are neceſſary Agents; they come in our way, but we do not know how: We cannot call up a figure of things, or words at pleaſure; ſome diſorder in our Mechaniſm hides or flattens them, which when it goes off, they ſtart up and ſerve us, but not by any act of our Underſtanding and Will. Thus we ſee, that in this ſingle undivided Eſſence of ours, there are different Principles of Operation, ſo different as liberty and neceſſity are from one another. I am far from thinking that this is a proper explanation or reſemblance of this myſtery, (and here I indeed jump in judgment with his Lordſhip) *yet it may be called in ſome*

ſort

ſort an illuſtration of it, ſince it ſhews us from our own Compoſition, that in one Eſſence there may be ſuch different Principles, which in their proper Character may be brought to the terms of a contradiction of being free and not free. So in the Divine Eſſence, which is the ſimpleſt and perfecteſt Unity, there may be three that may have a diverſity of Operations, &c. *Tenderden* Steeple and *Goodwyn* Sands! This is a worthy Simile indeed (to ſupplant that ſcouted one of the Ancients) in which is no repreſentation of the *Logos*, and its Parent Principle, nor of the Spirit of Holineſs that is in the Father and the Son, none of their co-eſſentiality, co-eternity, or order, all which are reſembled in that Simile which this undermines. But however, let us try the ſtuff, firſt generally, and then particularly. In the general view here are two Principles of neceſſity and freedom. The neceſſity conſiſts in our being, and its Phyſical Operations of Life and Death, the liberty in the Elective faculty of our Minds. Now, what can this reſemble in God, but the natural neceſſity of the Divine Life and the Operations, (if we may ſo ſpeak) by which the Son is generated from the Father, and the Holy Spirit derived from both, and the liberty of all God's other acts?

acts? But this cannot amount to a Trinity, nor reſemble contrary or different Principles, ſince God's liberty of acting differs not really from his neceſſary exiſtence. And both that neceſſity and liberty equally agree to every Perſon in the Trinity, and ſo cannot reſemble their diſtinction. But now we will be more particular, and trace theſe Philoſophick dictates κατὰ πόδα, that ſo we may ſee the depths of them. Firſt then his Lordſhip cannot tell whether there be in us two or three Principles of Operation, only if there be not three, be ſure there are two; ſo then we are ſure of a Figure for two, but not for three Principles, or rather Perſons in the Deity. This at firſt ſetting out is like to be a ſweet illuſtration of the Trinity! I doubt 'tis crack'd through ſome diſorder in its *Mechaniſm*. But whether two or three, they *differ not like Underſtanding and Will that are but different Modes of thinking*. Now if we take Underſtanding and Will for the Principles of actual intellection and volition, as his Lordſhip's compariſon of Principles to them ſeems to do, then I deny them to be Modes of thinking, ſince Principles are not the Modes of their Principiates, but give them to their Principiates. If his Lordſhip means not the Principles, but only the acts

of

of intellection and volition, then I deny volition to be a Mode of thinking. And whether you conceive the acts of intellection, and will mixt or pure, yet according to the true abſtract diſtinctions of them they are not divers Modes of the ſame ſpecifick Act, but Acts whoſe formal reaſon is ſpecifically different. Now as trifling as all this is, and ſeems to be, yet his Lordſhip ſeems to have had a great fetch in it againſt the Canonical Similitude of our Minds, leſt Underſtanding and Will, being near the ſame with Underſtanding and Love, and flowing from our Mind as its Parent, ſhould be thought a fair Simile for the Trinity; for this cauſe it was neceſſary that they ſhould be but two Modes of thinking. This being premiſed, our cogitations and reaſonings are acts of a free Principle, but our animal Operations are neceſſary. But what is this to the Theory of the Divine Nature? For theſe contrarieties of Operations proceed from the compoſition of contrary Subſtances, Soul and Body; whereas the Deity is moſt ſimple and uncompounded, and conſequently cannot be repreſented by any *compoſitum* whatſoever, eſpecially a compound of contraries. Well! but neceſſary Operations of the animal Life, ſeem to be from ſome Emana-

Emanations from our Souls. Very well! and do theſe ſeeming Emanations repreſent an *Idea* of the Emanations of the ſecond and third Perſon? I doubt not; for thoſe in the Deity are but two, but theſe of our Souls on our Bodies (if they were Emanations, as they are not) are very manifold. But if they be repreſentative Emanations, why then his Lordſhip here goes beyond due bounds in being pleaſed with the Notions and Similes of Emanations, or elſe theſe Notions are regular, and then why are the Fathers taxed for exorbitancy in them? But if theſe Emanations of the animal life are not repreſentative, why are they brought in here under the term of Emanations, to make us believe them repreſentative of the Divine Emanations? So much then for a Dyad repreſentative. Now a Kingdom for a third. Well then we have in acts of Memory, Imagination, and Diſcourſe a mixture of both Principles, (*i. e.* free and neceſſary) or a third that reſults out of them. As for his mixtures, I leave them purely to himſelf; but for his third reſulting Principle I am to ſeek. For it muſt be a Principle that is neither free, nor neceſſary, and ſuch a one is hard to be got for love or money; but however, that a Principle, neither free, nor neceſſary, ſhould

reſult

result from two, whereof one is free, and the other necessary, will I doubt bring his Lordship of mere necessity to the terms of a contradiction, how uncontradicted soever he affects to be.

§. 19. Advance we now from the old Similes of the Fathers to the Theology it self represented by them. Now it is not a novel Observation or Fancy, as his Lordship snearingly suggests, but the ancient, internal, Catholick, and substantial Wisdom of the Faith, that the * three adorable Persons in the Godhead, are an Eternal and Substantial Mind, Reason, and Holy Spirit. Now to avoid all cavil and equivocation, it is not unnecessary that I state the exactest Notions of the Fathers in these Terms of their Theology; For that the words being of very various and involved significations in common use, will be liable to easie mistakes, in this profound and critical Theory, especially when Readers shall discover sometimes

* *Iren.* l. 2. c 47. Deus enim, cum sit totus Mens, totus Ratio, & totus Spiritus operans, &c. Octav. ap. Minuc. Fœlic. Quid aliud & à nobis Deus, quam Mens, & Ratio, & Spiritus prædicatur? *Greg. Naz.* ad Patr. cum *Eccl. Naz.* ipsi permisit. κλείω καὶ ἀνοίγω τὴν ἐμὴν θύραν (scil. labiorum) νῷ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ πνεύματι. *Theodorit.* ad Græc. Infid. Ser. 2. de Principio. πιστεύεον ἄρα ὡς ὁκ τοῦ νοῦ γεῶντος ἐγεννήθη ὁ λόγος, καὶ πρηλθε τὸ πνεῦμα.

times the ſame terms to be promiſcuouſly uſed for different Perſons.

§. 20. I begin therefore with that of Mind. This moſt properly and primitively ſignifies the noetick or intellectual Principle in all rational Beings, the Spring, the Fountain, the Original of thoſe intellectual Graces and Perfections, that are found in ſuch Spiritual Natures. But by an eaſie Trope it is alſo very commonly uſed in all ſorts of Writings for the ἐνθυμήσεις the Conceptions, Counſels, Sentiments, Propenſions, and Reſolves of the Mind, as, were it neceſſary, might be ſhewn in infinite inſtances. But thirdly there hath been a Philoſophick and Artificial Senſe of the word of a more late invention, ſetting νόες or Minds for ſingle Spirits. Now the exact Notion of Mind as the firſt Principle in the Deity is the firſt of theſe, the proper and the Primitive, as it is the Original of God's Eſſential Reaſon, and Holy Spirit. Now according to this exact and canonical Notation the term Mind is not only an Eſſential, but a Paternal and Producent Character, ſo that ſpeaking with canonick accuracy we cannot ſay, that there are three Minds, for this is directly to aſſert three Fathers, and by conſequence three Sons, or *Logoi*, and ſo likewiſe three Holy Spi-

rits,

rits, ſince every ſuch Mind muſt have its Reaſon and Spirit, of which it is and muſt be a natural and neceſſary original. To aſſert three Minds in the ſenſe of Spirits is directly to aſſert three Gods, it being the ſame thing, and as irregular to ſay, there are in the Deity three Spirits, as three Gods. But if we will take the term equivocally in different Senſes, then we find ſome Fathers calling not only * the Father the Mind in diſtinction from the *Logos*, but the *Logos* alſo tropically by the name of Mind, as being the eſſential ἔννοια and Reaſon of the Father, of the ſame Eſſence, and therefore in reſpect of that Eſſence looſly called by the ſame name, according perhaps to the Pattern and Language of *Plato*, the Philoſophick Ancients uſing this homonymy, according to the taſt of the Platonick Philoſophers, (which were of ſo great credit among the *Greeks*) whom our Worthies cited as of Authority with the *Gentiles* in their Apologeticks in order to their

* *Athenag.* Leg. p. 38. ὁ θεὸς νοῦς ἀΐδιος ὢν εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον. at prius νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς. ſcil quod dixerat ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. Sic forte intelligendum illud p. 110. νοῦς, λόγος, σοφία, υἱὸς πατρός. *Theoph.* ad *Autolyc.* p. 129. τοῦτον (*Logon*) εἶχε (Pater) σύμβουλον ἑαυτῷ νοῦν. *Clem. Alex. Protrep.* υἱὸς τοῦ νοῦ γνήσεος ὁ θεῖος λόγος. at *Strom.* l. 7. ὅλος νοῦς, ὅλος φῶς πατρῷον, de eodem Logo.

their more eaſie converſion. And yet neither in this laxer acception or comprehenſiveneſs have I ever read among our Ancients the aſſertion of three Minds. For uſing the term mind in an eſſential Notion only, not a paternal, the aſſertion of three Minds would have looked like three Eſſences.

§. 21. But though we have ſufficiently proved our Doctrine not to be a novel whimſie, but a Primitive and Catholick Tradition; yet will I prove its foundations to be really Divine. For the Son of God is ſo called with relation to a Father from whom he derives his proper Subſiſtence and Character. And this Son of God the Father is he whom St. *John* calls the *Logos* according to the old *Jewiſh* Theology, God of God, the internal ſubſtantial Reaſon of God the Father, in whom or who is the Image of his Father, by whom the Father made and governs all things. And from hence this hath ever been the avowed Faith of all the * Primitive, as well as ſucceeding Ages, to be ſealed with their Blood and Sufferings, and was not a mere upſtart project to ſupply the former *Tritheiſm* taught in

* *Iren.* l. 1 c. 1. l. 2. c. 55. l. 3. c. 18. l. 4. c. 14. c. 28. c. 37. c. 75. l. 5. c. 6 *Juſt. Martyr.* Apol. 2. Dial. cum *Tryph. Clem. Alex.* Protrep. *Tertull* Præſc. & adv. *Jud.* & con. *Marcion.*

the more ancient Church. Now, if according to the common and univerſal Senſes and Notions of all Men, the Mind is the Parent and Original of all actual Reaſon in it, then if the Divine Reaſon be the trueſt and moſt Eſſential Reaſon, the Parent Principle thereof muſt be the trueſt and moſt Eſſential Mind; which Principle of this Reaſon the Scripture having owned Paternal, it follows that God the Father is an Eternal Mind, having a coeſſential Reaſon for its coeſſential Iſſue, the perfect Image and Character of its Parent.

l. 2. & con. *Prax. Novatian.* de Trinit. *Euſeb.* Præp. Ev. l. 7. c. 15. con. *Marcell.* l. 2. 17. & Eccl. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 2. *Panegyriſta Paulini* ap. *Euſ.* Eccl. Hiſt. l. 10. *Conſtant.* ad Sanctor. Cœtum ap. *Euſeb.* c. 9. *Paſtor Herm.* l. 3. Similit. 9. *Athenag.* Legat. *Theoph.* ad *Autolyc.* *Orig.* con. *Celſ.* l. 1. l. 2. l. 3. l. 4. l. 5. l. 6. l. 7. & de Princip. l. c. 2. *Cypr.* de Idol. Vanit. *Baſil.* con. *Eunom.* l. 5. & Serm. in Princip. *Naz.* de ſacr. Paſch. *Prudent.* περὶ Στεφάν. de Roman. Martyr & in Apotheoſ. *Greg. Thaumat.* ad *Origen.* *Athan.* ubiq;. *Pſeudo-Ambroſ.* de fide con. *Arian.* *Aug.* con. 5. Hæreſ. & in Evan. *Joh.* c. 1. Tract. 1, 2. & de Tempor. Ser. 190. & infinities plura reperies ejuſdem generis apud omnes.

§. 22. In the next place let us ſee, whether the Character of the Holy Spirit agrees well to the Subſtantial Love of God, according to the Doctrine of the traduced Ancients. Let it then be noted, that that Mind, in which a vital and conſubſtantial reaſon

reaſon perfectly ſubſiſts, doth by that reaſon in one clear, intuitive, luminous, and Archetypal *Idea* diſcern all poſſible Forms, Eſſences, Habitudes, Powers, and Reaſons of things, and therefore very particularly all the diſtinctive forms and differences of good and evil. From whence there muſt proceed in ſuch a Mind and Reaſon a vital and eſſential Spirit (which we in our Language would perhaps call a Principle) of Holineſs, to wit, an eſſential Love of all the Forms and Reaſons of Good, and therein an eſſential averſation of all the kinds and degrees of Evil, this being but one and the ſame Spirit, having different aſpects on different objects. Now without ſuch a Spirit of Love and Holineſs no being can be perfectly good or happy, ſince perfect goodneſs, as well as happineſs, conſiſts eſſentially in love and purity. Now the goodneſs of things muſt be the proper object of ſuch Love, and muſt be diſcerned by that actual Reaſon, that contains in it the *Idea's* of all things poſſible. Whence this Love is as eſſential to the Deity as Reaſon, and thereupon the Apoſtle ſaith, † that *God is Love*, the ſumm of which truth is nobly celebrated * by the great

† 1 *Joh.* 4. 8.

* *Conſt.* ad Sanct. Cæt. ap. *Euſ.* c. 7. ἡ γὰρ θεοῦ οὐσία χαίρει μὲν εὐδοκίαις· ἀποστρέ-

φεῦ δὲ πᾶσαν δυσσέβειαν, καὶ τὸ μέγιον φρόνημα· μισεῖ δὲ τόλμαν, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τὸ ζῶον ἐπηρμένην ἀλαζονείαν.

Constantine, as the Doctrine which he had been taught by the Christian Fathers herein, according with the perpetual Theology of God's People, who ever acknowledge this Holiness of the Divine Wisdom and Spirit from its constant indications.

* Sap. Sal. 1, 3, 4, 5.

*For * froward thoughts separate from God, and into a malicious Soul Wisdom will not enter, nor dwell in the Body that is subject unto sin. For the Holy Spirit of Discipline will fly deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and will not abide when unrighteousness cometh in, for Wisdom is a loving Spirit*, &c.

§. 23. But here again a fresh difficulty arises from the homonymy of terms. For St. *Paul* calling our Lord † the Wisdom of God, the generality and the exactest of the Fathers follow him in that style, and make the Wisdom and *Logos* to be the same subsistence distinct from the Holy Spirit. Some of the Ancients, as great as any, speaking distinctly * distinguish the *Logos* from the *Sophia*, and make the *Sophia* the Person of the Holy Spirit; and

† 1 *Cor.* 1. 24.

* *Iren. Theoph. Antiochen.* p. 81. c. 108. 114.

and yet again at other times † confound the *Logos* and *Sophia* for the ſame ſecond Perſon the Son, * whom alſo they call the Spirit of God the Father. Wherefore 'tis neceſſary to our Theory, that we remove this Cloud. And here we are to diſtinguiſh Wiſdom into ſpeculative, and practical, for which diſtinction there is apparent authority in the Scripture, and ground in our own inner Experience. Now the Reaſon of any Spiritual Nature is its formal proper ſpeculative Wiſdom, but an Holy Spirit and temper of Mind is the practical. In this latter ſenſe the forequoted place out of the Apochryphal Wiſdom calls the loving Spirit of God, or his Spirit of Diſcipline, Wiſdom; but † elſewhere the ſame Author Preaches, *that in Wiſdom*, which is the Artificer of all things, there is a Spirit, which among other attributes is *Holy*, and loves the thing that is good, and is Almighty, where the in-exiſtence of the Holy Spirit of Love in that Wiſdom, the Artificer of all things puts a diſtinction between this Spirit and Wiſdom, and ſo hereby Wiſdom in this place, as well as by its Character, muſt be the

† *Theoph. Antioch. p.* 81.

* *Theoph* p. 81. *Tertull.*

† Sap. Sal. 7. 22, *&c.*

Archetypal *Logos*, or Architectonick Reaſon of God the Father. And hence theſe ambiguous Fathers ſeem to have copied their Theories and Language, ſometimes calling the *Logos* Wiſdom, to wit the intuitive, ſometime the Holy Spirit, as the practical Wiſdom of God the Father. And ſo there are learned Men, that ground the alledged homonymy of the Word Spirit in ſome forms of Scripture. But I, that think the Scripture as a Rule for Canonick Theology, thinking it unſafe to fix any exorbitant Senſes on the Terms expreſſive of the Trinity, without abſolute neceſſity, am apt to think thoſe Fathers called the *Logos* the Spirit of God ſometimes, through ſome Scriptures by them ſo miſtaken, or appearing in that ſenſe to them, under a looſe and general Notion, that whatſoever iſſues from the Eſſence of God the Father ſo iſſues by a Spiritual Efflux, or elſe is of a Spiritual Subſtance as the Father is, and ſo as *Tertullian* calls the *Logos*, Spirit of Spirit, and God of God. But ſince all theſe Fathers expreſly own a Trinity of Perſons, the third of which is ſignally characterized by the appropriate Title of Holy Spirit, there can be no doubt of the conſonancy of their Faith to the Catholick Doctrine, and to this Theory of it in the Holy Spirit,

rit, which to ſerve his Lordſhip I am here to illuſtrate.

§. 24. Theſe Bars being thus removed, we ſhall proceed to examine on what ground this Subſtantial Love of God is called by the name of Spirit. Now this word, though ſo very variouſly ſignificant, is however uſed either abſolutely, as when it's ſaid, God is a Spirit, or Angels are miniſtring Spirits, a Spirit hath not Fleſh and Blood, and other ſayings of the ſame formal intention in the Word, or elſe relatively and attributively to ſomething whoſe Spirit it is, or is called. Of this latter form is the characteriſtick Title of the Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit of God and Chriſt, &c. And the Word Spirit thus relatively attributed to Beings ſimply immaterial denotes an active Principle, Power, or Virtue in them, and this either Potential, or Moral. Thus it is mentioned as a potential Principle; *Joſh.* 5. 1. *Eſa.* 19. 3. *Luk.* 1. 17. as a moral Principle; *Ezr.* 1, 1, 5. *Pſal.* 32. 2. and 34. 18. and 51. 10, 17. *Eſa.* 57. 15. *Ezek.* 11. 19. and 36. 26. *Matth.* 5. 3. *Luke* 9. 55. *Joh.* 4. 23, 24. *Rom.* 8. 15, 16. 1 *Cor.* 4. 21. *Eph.* 4. 23. 1 *Pet.* 3, 4. and ſo in infinite other places. So likewiſe the Spirit of God ſeems oft to denote in him, what we commonly call a

Principle acting potentially, but chiefly and most especially in the sanctifical Operations, of all which the Holy Spirit is the proper and immediate Spring and Original. Hence the Works of the Creation as attributed to the Spirit of God; *Job* 26. 13. and 33. 4. where I see no reason to depart from the ordinary and canonical and characteristick sense of the Term. From which places in my opinion we may best interpret, *Gen.* 1. 2. where it is said, that *the Spirit of God moved or hovered upon the face of the Waters.* In this potential way of Operation, the Spirit of God acted the Prophets, Judges, and other Worthies of *Israel* in their mighty Words and Works, that exceeded the Power of Humane Nature, as may be seen in very many Texts of Scripture. Thus the Holy Spirit came upon the Virgin *Mary*, *and the Power of the most High did over-shadow her*, Luke 1. 35. For I here preferr the Catholick Interpretation of the Creeds (which teach this to be the supervention of the Holy Spirit, from other like Texts, and Universal Tradition) before the sense of * *Theophilus Antiochenus*, who applies them to the *Logos*, as speaking by the Prophets, though the

* Ad *Autolyc.* p. 81. Τοῦτο οὖν ὢν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀρχὴ, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου, &c.

the † Catholick Church hath determined the Divine Spirit that ſpake by them, to be the third Perſon; Which Spirit acting *Elias* was feared by *Obadiah*, that it would carry the Prophet out of all diſcovery, 1 *King.* 18. 12. And according to this potential notation, we call all ſubtle and vigorous Powers in Nature Spirits, as alſo the courage and activity of any animal. I know the *Rabbins*, *Crellius*, and others make this potential Spirit to be a created effluent Virtue; but the permanency of it in God, with its other properties and deſcriptions every where exhibited in the Scriptures, do evince the contrary, reaſon it ſelf alſo witneſſing, that God never was without an omnipotent Spirit of Holineſs, which may very properly conſiſt in the eſſential Love of God, than which what can be more vigorous, active, influential, and productive? We ſee how ſtrong the Spring and Spirit of an ardent love is toward the moſt mighty adventures, and how infinitely more muſt it be in the Divine Nature, from which it gave Life and Spirit to univerſal Nature, and bleſſed every thing according to its order, and cheriſhes all things by a lively and penetrating Providence, and drives on all

† *Symb. Conſtantinop.* τὸ διὰ προφητῶν λαλῆσαν.

all the Motions and Springs of the whole Creation, by a perpetual and conſtant impulſe, and at times exerted miraculous Operations, to the manifeſtation of its tranſcendent Power, Goodneſs, and Holineſs, and thereby to the converſion of Men to the Living God? But this Principle (if I may ſo call it without offence, as I deſign without error) more exhibits its own appropriate celebrated Character of Holy to our Conceptions, by actual Inſpirations of Sanctity into all ſanctified Minds. And ſuch is the ſenſe of the Catholick Antiquity. For being * original Holineſs it ſelf, it's moſt connatural and conſimilar Operation is the ſanctifical, for which cauſe it is ſignally called Holy, as the ſubſtantial immediate Principle of all communications of Sanctity and Goodneſs to the Creatures: And as a † good and holy temper in the Soul of Man is called a good and holy Spirit, which therefore acts accordingly, and gives us thereby a Theory of the Holy

* *Orig. Hom.* 11. in Numer. 18. & de Princip. l. 1. c. 8. *Greg. Thaumat.* in Symbol. Revelat. *Athan.* con. *Arium* Diſp. & Dial. de Trinit. *Naz.* de *Heron.* Philoſoph. *Baſil.* con. *Eunom.* l. 5. de Sp. S. *Epiſcop.* Philoſopho in Concil. *Nicen.* ap. *Socr.* Eccl. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 7. *Pſeudo-Chryſ.* in *Matth.* 7. Hom. 18. *Aug.* de verb. Dom. in Evan. *Matth.* c. 12. Ser. 11. *Fauſtin.* ad *Flaccil.* Imperat. de fide con. *Arian.*

† *Clem. Alex.* Strom. l. 6. Καὶ τὸ ἐπηγε-

Holy Spirit of God; So the essential Spirit of Holiness in God, is (if my infirmities may be permitted to speak my sense) as it were the very temper of his Nature, called often also his Heart and Soul under the same connotation; which the impious Man is said to grieve; *Esa.* 63. 10. *Eph.* 4. 30. as being an internal and essential Principle offended by those Wits, to which it bears an eternal and unalterable aversion, which is also very strong and potential, being † expresly called by some Fathers the substantial Love of God from the Authority of St. *John*. From this property of Love, Goodness, and Holiness, it is called by St. *Paul* the Spirit of Holiness; *Rom.* 1. 4. (for I see no reason to recede from the canonical propriety) and by *Nehemias* and *David* the good Spirit of God teaching and leading Men unto righteousness. *Neh.* 19. 20. *Psal.* 143. 10. And the Psalmist describes the Holy Spirit of God, and a right Spirit in Man as consimilar Principles of moral Goodness, the one as the

φόμενοι (Christiani) Θεὸν διδάσκαλον μόγις εἰς ἔννοιαν ἀφικνοῦνται Θεοῦ τῆς χάρκτος αὐτοῦ συλλαμβανούσης εἰς ποσὴν ἐπίγνωσιν· οἷον θελήματι θέλημα, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν ἐθίζοντες.

† *Ambr.* de dignit. hum. condit. c. 2. *Greg. Nyssen.* de homin. Opific. c. 5. *Aug.* in Ep. *Joh.* Tract. 6. & in Evang. *Joh.* c. 2. Tract. 9. & in c. 17. Tract. 105.

the temper of the Divine, the other as the Temper of an Humane Mind. *Pſal.* 51. 10, 11. which being by Sanctification likened to the Spirit of God, is ſaid to communicate of the Holy Spirit, 2 *Cor.* 13.13. *Philip.* 2. 1. whereby we are ſaid to be one Spirit with God, 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. by being herein transformed into his Image, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. and purified in obeying the Truth by the Spirit unto an unfeigned love of the Brethren. 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. And when St. *Paul* aſſerts the fruits of the Spirit to be Love, Joy, Peace, Long-ſuffering, Gentleneſs, Goodneſs, Faith, Meekneſs, Charity, Righteouſneſs, and Truth, *Gal.* 5. 22. *Eph.* 5. 9. by the Fruit he ſhews the nature of the Root and Principle, *viz.* that the Spirit of God is by Nature Loving, Good, and Holy, and by Grace endearing and ſanctifical. And this Character of the Spirit of God does alſo illuſtrate the potential Notion; for the more pure and unmixt any Powers are, the more quick and ſpirituous are their Faculties and Operations, from which invigorating influences of God's Holy Spirit, we are not only ſanctified, but made fervent in Spirit, *Rom.* 12. 11. and ſtrengthened in our inner Man, *Eph.* 3. 16. and armed againſt the Powers of Evil, *Eph.* 6.17. to mortifie the deeds of the Body, *Rom.* 8. 13.

8. 13. and to abound in hope through the Power of the Holy Ghoſt. *Rom.* 15. 13. This is the mighty Spirit that acted *Elias*, this was that Spirit, that made *Jeremy* a defenced City, and an Iron Pillar, and brazen Walls againſt the whole Land, *&c. Jer.* 1. 18, 19. and ſupported all the Prophets, Apoſtles, and Martyrs againſt all the Powers of Hell and this World. And yet by what influence, but that of the Divine Holineſs and Love, by which they were not only inſpired, but inſpirited with ſuch holy ardours and rapturous affections of God, as made them to deſpiſe and triumph over all Oppoſitions, and to tread upon the Adder, and Scorpion, and all the Power of the Enemy? Now if this be not true Doctrine, I deſire his Lordſhip to refute it; if it be, let him forbear to flout the Ancients, that taught the Holy Spirit to be Love.

§. 25. But as I have here given a conſuetudinary and canonical account of this Title from common and ſacred Language, ſo will I endeavour to add an Etymological. The Word Spirit then in all our learned Languages is derived from Verbs of breathing, or blowing, and ſo primitively ſignifies a Breath, or Gale of Air, which ſeeming to common apprehenſions the moſt ſubtil, agil, and penetrating of all ſublunary

Ele-

Elements, its name was therefore, for want of another more suitable, applied to immaterial Substances, Principles, and active Powers, especially plastick and animant, by way of eminent distinction from gross matter, and passive dulness. Now such immaterial and subtil Powers exert their Operation by at least a seeming spiration of influences. And the moral Principles of the Mind proceed internally from it, *as it were by an odorous form of Spiration, grateful unto it self, and God the Author, when good, and inspired from above for a sweet savour. And such a Notion the Apochryphal Wisdom of *Solomon* gives us of the Divine Wisdom as including in it the † Spirit of God. *For it is the* ἀτμὶς *the breath of the Power of God, and an* ἀπόῤῥοια *an Efflux of the glory of the Almighty.* And *Job*'s Friend *Elihu* seems to have taken the Spirit of God, as a Virtue or Principle in the Deity, that gave him (and all Men) life by a spirant Operation; *the Spirit of God hath made me, and the* נשמת שדי *the Breath of the Almighty hath given me life,* Job 33. 4. referring to the Tradition thus recor-

* *Athan.* ad *Serap* Sp. S. non esse Creatur. τὸ μὲν γὰρ χρίσμα τὴν εὐωδίαν καὶ πνοὴν τοῦ Χρίοντος ἔχει, καὶ οἱ χριόμενοι τούτου μεταλαμβάνοντες λέγουσι, χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν.

† Ch. 7. v. 25.

recorded in *Gen.* 2. 7. *that God breathed into Man the Breath of Life*, of which * we own his Spirit to be Lord and Giver. But as to ſanctifical Operations on created Spirits and Minds, it is univerſally acknowledged that the Spirit of God exerts them by a Divine manner of Inſpiration. So that I conclude, that Etymologically the Spirit of God is ſo called, as being derived from the Father and the Son by an unconceivable manner of internal Spiration of Love eſſential, and as inſpiring into all Beings, their proper Virtues and Powers by an invigorating ſtream of influences, eſpecially in the ſanctifying Operations on our Minds, by which new and holy Spirits are created in us.

* Symbol. *Conſtantinop.* τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν.

§. 26. Now leſt this Spirit of Love and Holineſs in the Divine Nature, ſhould be reputed Perſonal from its Perſonal Deſcriptions in Holy Writ, ſome have fanſied it to be a mere unſubſtantial and imperſonal Quality in God the Father only, perſonated only by Trope and Figure. But againſt theſe it is to be noted, that he is the Spirit of the Son alſo, and ſo for that cauſe, even upon this Hypotheſis, the Son muſt be God with the Father. But further there being no poſſible imperfection in the Deity,

ty, it can admit of no unſubſtantial Qualities, for as they are imperfections in themſelves, ſo do they ſuppoſe an imperfection in their Subjects, whether adorned, or vilified by them. If therefore there be a permanent Spirit of Holineſs in the Deity, it muſt be perfect, and for that cauſe ſubſtantial. And this Subſtantiality is the ground of that Perſonality, which we attribute to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit according to the order and meaſure of our Conceptions, without the help of any *Socinian* Metonymy, or *Proſopopœia*, according to † the Catholick and Primitive Theology aſſerted by St. *Auſtin*.

† *Aug.* in Ev. *Joh.* c. 17. Tract. 105. Spiritus eſt Patris & Filii, tanquam charitas ſubſtantialis, & conſubſtantialis amborum.

§. 27. But to evade this Truth, there were * Hereticks of old, as well as of late, that fell in with the *Rabbins*, and made the Holy Spirit a mere Operation, or an effluent Virtue, not in God, but without, and from the Deity, terminated in us, which † *Crellius* every where calls a middle quality between the eſſential Power of God, and its more manifeſt effects, to which middle quality, he (much like his Maſter *Socinus*)

* *See* Didym. de Sp. S.

† *See his Book* de Spirit. Sancto.

Socinus, ſays, Perſonal Attributes are given by a Metonymy, or a *Proſopopœia* ariſing ſometimes from a Metonymy of the effect, which is this Spirit, for the efficient, which is God, whoſe Perſon this effected Spirit, or middle Quality figuratively bears, or from a Metonymy of the Adjunct, which is this effected Spirit, for its divinely inſpired Subject, whoſe Perſon alſo this Spirit in like manner ſometimes doth ſuſtain. For the Confirmation whereof he quotes *Exod.* 31. 3. and 35. 31. comparing therewith *Exod.* 28. 3. and 35. 35. *Numb.* 24 2. and 27. 18. *Deut.* 34. 9. *Judg.* 3. 10. and 6. 34. and 11. 29. and 13 25. and 14. 19. and 15. 14. 1 *Sam.* 10. 6, 10. and 11. 6. and 16. 13, 14, &c. and 18. 10. and 19. 9, 20, 23. 1 *King.* 18. 12. and 22. 24. 1 *Chr.* 12. 18. and 28. 12. 2 *Chron.* 15. 1. *Job* 33. 4. *Pſal.* 51. 11, 12. *Eſa.* 44. 3. and 63. 11. proofs enough one would think in all Conſcience.

§. 28. But ſuppoſing, that all theſe Texts had denoted a Principle created or inſtilled into us, yet here is no Perſonal Repreſentation thereof; whereas it was to be proved, that the Spirit of God in thoſe Texts, that Characterize him Perſonally, is a mere created Quality in us, and that it is no where otherwiſe, never any virtue eſſential

to God. For we need not deny, that the Holy Spirits and Principles, inſpired by, and from the Subſtantial Spirit of God into us, may ſometimes derive the Name as well as the Nature of that their Original, and the moſt Catholick Divines concede it; but where the Original Spirit of God is diſtinguiſhed from, and aſſerted the Author of thoſe Operations and Graces, there the Spirit cannot be thoſe very Operations, or Graces produced by them, as thoſe middle Virtues and Qualities muſt be. See 1 *Cor.* 12. 1. to 12. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 13. 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. *Gal.* 5. 22. *Joh.* c. 14. c. 15. c. 16. 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. In which laſt the Holy Spirit is ſaid to be in Heaven, and conſequently can be no middle Quality in us, and yet in Heaven perſonally diſtinct from the Father, and the Word; which I take to be a good Argument from a good Authority in deſpite of Hereticks and defective Libraries; to which I could add very many more, were it neceſſary. But the truth is, the Texts alledged by *Crellius* do not all manifeſtly denote by the Spirit of God a mere created Virtue or Quality, but may (except ſome few to be by and by conſidered) denote the eſſential Spirit of God ſupervening upon Men, and creating in them the Spirits of Wiſdom, Vigour, Prophecy, Life,

Life, &c. And particularly where *Elihu*, *Job* 33. 4. ſaith, *the Spirit of God hath made me*, he implies the præ-exiſtence of that Spirit before himſelf, and ſo not after effected in him, being indeed a Virtue operant, not operated, but a precedent cauſe of the Operation it ſelf. And though according to the literal form of the Hebrew, the evil Spirit, that troubled *Saul*, is called the Lords evil Spirit, 1 *Sam.* 16. 15, 16, 23. and 18. 10. and 19. 9. yet this may denote, not a divine Operation ſurely, which is not evil, but a wicked infernal Perſonal Spirit, the Lictor or Carniſex, which God ſent to puniſh him. But if we keep to *Crellius*'s Notion, and let the evil Spirit here be a Quality effected in *Saul*, it muſt be from ſome inſpiring Agent, which, the Quality being evil, cannot be God, and ſo muſt be an evil Spirit of darkneſs מאת יהוה 1 *Sam.* 16. 14. ſent from the Lord. And if ſo, how can it be evinced, that the Term evil Spirit does not denote the Perſon of the Evil Angel, but only the effect of his infernal Operation? And as to the Spirit of Wiſdom, with which God had filled ſome Perſons for making the Prieſts habits, &c. *Exod.* 28. 3. it appears not to be that effected Wiſdom it ſelf, but the Divine Principle efficient

thereof from *Exod.* 31. 1. Where God ſays, he had filled *Bezaleel* with the Spirit of God, in Wiſdom, and Underſtanding, *&c.* where the filling Power, *i. e.* the Spirit of God is diſtinguiſhed from its effect, *i. e.* that Wiſdom and Underſtanding inſpired by the Spirit of God into him. And that Spirit of God producent of that Wiſdom, *Exod.* 31. 3. might well be called the Spirit of that Wiſdom, which it produced, as likewiſe *Eſa.* 11. 2. So that in all theſe places, I am verily perſwaded, that the Spirit of God ſignifies not a mere Divine Operation, nor a mere Virtue divinely operated, but a Principle and Subſtantial Power operant. But that the Term Spirit of God may be ſometimes put for the Grace effected thereby; nay, and that actions of Subjects are many times elegantly attributed to their Adjuncts (as it may alſo happen to the effect for the efficient) I ſhall not gainſay; but ſuch mere Metonymies do not preſently exhibit a formal *Proſopopœia* of thoſe Adjuncts or Effects without other technical Schemes, ſuch as uſually appear in Poetick or Dramatick fancies, not in ſerious Proſe, plain Diſcourſe, didactick Inſtitutions, eſpecially in the Simple, Catechetical, and Inartificial Rules of Faith delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Be-

Beſides with Poets and other Painters perſonated Qualities put on the feminine Veil, Face, and Sex; but Chriſt deſcribes his Holy Spirit * as a Maſculine Perſon, when he calls him Paraclete, with a Perſonal Pronoun *He*, to ſhew him as it were exactly both in Nature and Perſon. Where, as Biſhop *Pearſon* well obſerves on *Joh.* 16. 13, 14, *&c.* upon the Article of the Holy Ghoſt, thoſe perſonal Attributes of the Spirit can be by no means applied to God the Father, nor to the Apoſtles by any Metonymy whatſoever according to the *Socinian* pretention. But further, that ſupreme Spirit of God is only one, which yet by manifold Operations creates many kinds of Virtues, which therefore are plurally called Spirits, 1 *Cor.* 12. 10. 1 *Cor.* 14. 32.

* *Joh.* 14. 16. Ἄλλον παράκλητον & 16. 13, 14. ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. —— ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει. ita 15. 26. ὁ παράκλητος — ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει, &c.

§. 29. Now to break off this blow, *Crellius* coins a double ſort of Unity for the Holy Spirit; One generical conſiſting in this, that all ſuch Spirits, how numerous and various ſoever, are yet of one Genus of Spirit, as all individual Bodies, and ſorts of Bodies are included in one Genus of Body. But ſuch Unity is but merely notio-

nal, and uncapable of individual Acts and Offices, which yet are aſcribed to the one Holy Spirit. For when † *one and the ſelf ſame Spirit is ſaid to diſtribute all gifts according as he will*; it is manifeſt that many ſingle, and many ſorts of Graces are given by the will of one only Spirit, individually One. For individual and actually exiſtent effects muſt be the products of individual and actually exiſting Cauſe, or Cauſes, not from mere Genus and Species, which are not the ſubjects of Hiſtorical Relations. For it cannot be ſaid of Subſtance, or Body in general, that one and the ſelf ſame Subſtance, or Body produces all Phyſical effects in the material World, nor of Man in Specie, that one and the ſelf ſame Man performs all the Acts and Offices that are done by all and every ſingle Man. Nor is Genus and Species capable of Perſonal Unities and Diſtinctions. But now the Apoſtle diſtinguiſhes both the Operations and Effects of one and the ſelf ſame Spirit, both from themſelves, and that Spirit, not only numerically, but ſpecifically, and yet aſſerts them the products * of one and the ſelf ſame Spirit, one and the ſelf ſame Lord, one and the ſelf ſame God; ſhewing at leaſt

† ἓν δὲ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα.

* 1 *Cor.* 12.

leaſt the Unity of the Spirit, to be ſuch, and the ſame, as is the Unity of the Lord and God, which muſt be therefore moſt perfectly Individual. But if each particular Divine Inſpiration, or its produced Graces had been ſo many diſtinct Holy Spirits of God in themſelves, ſince there are ſuch multitudes, and multiplicities of them, there was no reaſon why in the ſame breath he ſhould aſſert them many and manifold, and yet but one operant Spirit only, which therefore muſt be diſtinct from them as the Cauſe from the effect, as the Author from the product, and as the Donor from the gift.

§. 30. His ſecond ſort of Unity is that of Origine, by which he pretends the Spirit to be called One, becauſe though infinitely manifold, or diviſible in it ſelf, yet it proceeds from one God, and in this reſpect may be called One. But neither will this laſt fit. For the Terms [one and the ſelf ſame] are too narrow, and expreſs a cloſer Unity, and cannot be applied to innumerable particulars that are only of one Original. For all particular Men cannot be ſaid to be one and the ſelf ſame Man, which performs all humane actions that are, becauſe all Men originally deſcend from one Father *Adam*: Nor can all the *Iſraelites*

be ſaid to be one and the ſelf ſame *Iſraelite* that deſtroyed the *Canaanites*, becauſe they all deſcended from one Father *Iſrael*: Nor can all the *Socinians* be called one and the ſelf ſame *Socinian*, that wriggles himſelf into a thouſand tricks and turnings, becauſe they all deſcended from one Doctor or Father *Fauſtus* (for I will not meddle with *Lælius*.) But in truth, if there had been a vaſt number of the Holy Spirits of God, and theſe but mere Qualities, to which Perſonal Names, Pronouns, and Predicates are ſo often attributed in the ſingular number of one Holy Spirit, on the ſcore of a mere generical or originary Unity, why do we never plurally read of many ſuch Holy Spirits of God ſo perſonated according to this invention, with an open acknowledgment of their Plurality, and ſometimes of their Imperſonality; but only of one ſuch Holy Spirit, under ſuch Perſonal Titles and Deſcriptions? Or why had not the Article of the Holy Spirit in the Creeds been always taught and profeſſed according to this pretty novel interpretation? Since the Church ought to have been taught and dealt with plainly, and not tricked into mazes or impieties by Figures, Fetches, and Sophiſtries more ambiguous and involved than the Devil's Oracles.

cles. Nor will the ſeven Spirits of God in the Revelation help, for they are waiting Miniſters at the Throne of God, not Qualities inſpired into us, and they are but ſeven neither, a number far too ſmall for the kinds or numbers of inſpired Graces. We ſee then, that the Wit of Man cannot bear up againſt the Truth and Wiſdom of God. And herein our Countryman *Biddle* was ſo convinced of * the errors of his *Socinian* Fathers, that he even ſcouts them, and roundly falls off to the Elder Enemies of the Holy Spirit, with whom he paſſed for a created Perſon.

* Bid. *of the Holy Spirit.*

§. 31. Hoping then that this may help to convince his Lordſhip of the Perſonality of the Holy Spirit of Divine Love, I will a little for the ſake of others endeavour alſo to prove the Holy Spirit not to be a created Perſon. This will appear firſt from all thoſe places in which he is ſaid † to be put, or poured out upon Men, which is no where ſpoken of Angels, which yet are Spirits miniſtring to the Heirs of Salvation, which argument convin-

† *Didym.* de Sp. S. l. 1. ex verſion. *Hieron.* Ipſum quoq; Effuſionis nomen increatam Spiritus Sancti ſubſtantiam probat. Neq; enim Deus, cum Angelum mittit, aut aliam creaturam effun-

ced

dam dicit de Angelo meo, aut throno, aut dominatione.

ced the *Socinians* of the *Macedonian* Error. But a Divine Virtue, though in its Energies it recede not from God, yet becauſe of thoſe influences is it ſelf ſaid, and in a manner ſeems to be poured out upon, and communicated to divinely-inſpired Souls, into which a connatural, congenial, or conſimilar Virtue is thereby infuſed. So the Spirit of God poured out upon all Fleſh, *Joel* 2. 28, 29. is a Virtue ſubſtantially intrinſical to the Deity, which yet St. *Peter* teſtifies to be the ſame Spirit which acted the Apoſtles at the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, *Act.* 2. and which is celebrated with Perſonal Titles, Pronouns, and Attributes, *Joh.* c. 14. c. 15. c. 16. And herein alſo is aſſerted his omnipreſence, as alſo by the Apocryphal Wiſdom of *Solomon*, ch. 1. v. 7. *The Spirit of the Lord filleth the World*; *and by the Pſalmiſt*, Pſal. 139. 7. *Whither ſhall I go then from thy Spirit? or whither ſhall I flee from thy preſence?* Here the Spirit of God cannot be a middle Virtue inſpiring *David*, ſince this he had no reaſon to dread or ſhun, and yet all Men by ſinning (eſpecially by knavery and doubling) ſhun and fly from this Grace too eaſily. Nor are the acts of Divine Vengeance ever called the Spirit of God in the Patient.

Patient. Neither is this Spirit of God here a created Spirit, whoſe Preſence cannot be eſcaped, ſince the Pſalmiſt here only ſpeaks of God's Preſence and Power. See onward to v. 17. And further * though one created Angel can follow one ſingle, or more ſociated Men, whereſoever we can ſuppoſe one way for their flight, yet one ſingle Angel cannot at once follow, or be preſent to all Men in all their Diſperſions, which omnipreſence however all Men ought to own in the Spirit of God. Now if any Man ſhall urge, that the Words [thy Spirit] are put for [thee], as [my Spirit] for [I] *Gen.* 6. 3. The ſame Pſalmiſt's ſame words in a full literal intention, Pſal. 51. 11. *Caſt me not away from thy preſence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me*, muſt interpret our preſent Text without a circumlocution, as many others will that of *Gen.* 6. 3. And yet admitting a Figure or Trope, it repreſents the Spirit of God as God, which is what I contend for, as being internal to the Divine Mind, *Eſa.* 40. 13, 14. With this Omnipreſence he hath alſo a Divine

* *Didym.* de Sp. S. l. 1. Demonſtratur Angelica Virtus ab hoc prorſus aliena. Angelus quippe; qui aderat, verbi gratia, Apoſtolo in Aſia oranti, non poterat ſimul eodem tempore adeſſe aliis in cæteris partibus conſtitutis. Vid. præced. & ſeq. præd. & *Athanaſ.* omnino Diſp. con. *Arium.*

vine Empire, by which he diſtributes all the Divine Graces to whom, and as he will every where, 1 *Cor.* 12. 11. All which put together doth more fully ſet forth the Singularity, Omnipreſence, and Supremacy of the Holy Spirit, than thoſe mere forms of Speech, which as they are attributed to the Holy Spirit in the Kingdom of God, are alſo attributed to the Prince of Devils in the Kingdom of Darkneſs, which is *Biddle*'s grand Evaſion from our Arguments taken from ſuch ſayings, that the Spirit dwells in us, teaches us, &c. for theſe, and ſuch like expreſſions are uttered of the Devil, that he deceives the World, blinds the Souls of Unbelievers, Captivates Impenitents, takes away the Word out of the hearts of the Hearers, became a lying Spirit in Four Hundred Prophets, &c. which ſayings do not indeed denote the Devil's Perſonal Omnipreſence to all at once, but only that he thus reacheth Men by his Miniſters, which *Biddle* would perſwade us of the Holy Spirit alſo; but they had certainly denoted a terreſtrial Omnipreſence, if it had been added, that there is but one only Evil Spirit, and that he alone by his own Perſonal Operations had thus acted on all wicked Men, and that no mortal Man can avoid his Preſence and Power,

none

none of which is expreſſed of the Devil, and yet if it had, his excluſion out of Heaven is aſſerted alſo, where yet the Holy Spirit of God dwells and ſhines in eſſential Glory; not to mention alſo, that the Devil, who long time univerſally tyrannized, is yet never ſaid to be poured out upon all Fleſh. But now the aforeſaid Attributes given to the Prince of Devils, manifeſtly ſet forth his Supremacy in the Kingdom of Darkneſs; and therefore in the Kingdom of God the like Phraſes of the Holy Spirit of God muſt denote his Supremacy therein, and by conſequence his Deity, ſince God alone is the one Supreme King of that Kingdom, and thus our Faith is eſtabliſhed firmly againſt the *Macedonians* alſo.

§. 32. Now of what hath been ſaid, thus much I believe would be granted by all the Anti-perſoniſts, that there is in God the Father an eſſential Reaſon, and Spirit of Sanctity, though not perſonally ſubſiſtent. For a Perſon being with them a complete *ſuppoſitum rationale*, and intellectual Subject, or Being ſeparate and ſtanding ſingle from all others, they hold it a contradiction to hold three Perſons in one individual Deity.

§. 33. To

§. 33. To this, I hope, to give ſo juſt and candid an anſwer as may embolden his Lordſhip to joyn in the Litany heartier, and to ſpeak clearer next time in his Theological Eſſays. The name Perſon, or whatſoever anſwers thereto in the learned Languages, firſt of all ſignifies a Man's Face, natural and artificial, and thence the whole ſingle Man; hence after were the Gods in profane, and intellectual Spirits in ſacred Writings repreſented perſonally, and ſo now the Term Perſon agrees to all ſingle intelligent Beings by common and inartificial uſe. But we, that have no natural *Idea* of the Modes of Subſiſtence peculiar to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit without Divine Revelation, cannot without it conceive the form of their Perſonality. So for this we muſt reſt wholly on Divine Revelation. And accordingly I would deſcribe a Perſon for a Theological Term thus; whatſoever hath Perſonal Titles, and Characters properly attributed to it by God's Word, the ſame is a Perſon, though we cannot frame an *Idea* of the form of its Perſonality. And then I can add, but the Divine Mind, Reaſon, and Holy Spirit have three properly diſtinguiſhing Perſonal Characteriſtick Titles, Father, Son, and Paraclete to be owned in our avowed Faith

and

and Baptiſm, therefore theſe three are three diſtinct Perſons, though we cannot form a natural *Idea* of the Mode of their Perſonality; * and though yet we are ſure they are not ſeparate and disjoyned like three Humane Perſons. In this myſtery therefore the ſenſe of this term is not vulgar, nor of common Notion, but peculiarly and neceſſarily Technical. For ſince God hath revealed that in the Unity of his Nature, there is one firſt Principle with two other co-eternally emanant or deſcendent from him, and ſubſiſting individually in him, by which he created and governs all things, and this under the Perſonal and Diſtinctive Characters of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit the Paraclete, and many other Perſonal Attributes diſtinctive of their proper Subſiſtences in the Eſſential Unity of the Godhead, the Term Perſon fell unavoidably into Canonical uſe, though under a ſtrict care againſt the vulgar notion of Humane, or ſuch like ſeparate Perſons, and reſtrained only to the revealed Theories of the Myſtery. And under this regular limitation,

* *Aug.* de Tempor. Ser 189 Ego Perſonas in Patre, & Filio, & Spiritu Sancto non dico quaſi perſonas hominum. Perſonam Patris dico quod Pater eſt, & Filii quod Filius eſt, & Spiritus Sancti quod Spiritus Sanctus eſt. — dividuntur enim proprietatibus, ſed naturâ ſociantur.

mitation, I challenge the Art of the World to find out any one Characteriſtick Term ſo fit, proper, and congruous to denote their formal Perſonalities aſcribed to them in the Scripture as this of Perſon, in which the whole Catholick Church of old unanimouſly agreed antecedently to any Conciliar Definitions, and is therefore of greater Antiquity and Authority than the Greek Hypoſtaſis, which though well founded in * *Heb.* 1. 3. yet was a while of ambiguous uſe and interpretation, till it was by the help of *Athanaſius* and others canonically adjuſted and fixed according to the ſenſe of our Term Perſon. And yet ſuppoſing a ſenſible defect in theſe Terms Perſon, and Subſiſtence; what modeſt Man would upbraid the whole Church of God for ſuch an inſuperable impotency in Humane Nature (which all wiſe Men perceive, and own in their ſpeaking of God) after its utmoſt endeavours, cares, and conſultations upon cogent neceſſities to fix the terms of our Faith and Doctrine in the beſt manner poſſible, while yet the Revilers can produce nothing better or equal? 'Tis certainly an intollerable indecency againſt the Gravity, Duty, Care, and Right of Men that are in Authority of pre-

* Χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως.

preſcribing Doctrines in any Profeſſion whatſoever; for to ſuch certainly it belongs, to fit Terms of Art to their Theories, as reaſon ſhall require, as well as they can, without the merit or hazard of malevolence and detraction.

§. 34. But becauſe I would fill the thirſty and candid Soul, with a ſatisfying Theory herein, I will dig deeper into the grounds of theſe Perſonal Characters in the Scriptures, and the Traditional Term of Perſon thence Canonically uſed. Firſt then, Perſonality is a Character only of what is ſubſtantial and intellectual, as are the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit the Paraclete, who therefore have a good ground of bearing thoſe Perſonal Titles. But tho' theſe peculiar Titles have this common Baſis, yet have they their peculiar and formal reaſons of Diſtinction: The firſt Principle of all being called Father from his Eternal generation of the *Logos*, which is called Son from being ſo eternally generated of the Father's Subſtance, without diviſion or partition thereof. And * here the Father being ever Father, never Son, and the *Logos* ever Son, never Father, St. *Athanaſius* juſtly, as well as ſagaciouſly, appropriates theſe Titles to theſe Perſons in a

* Con. *Arian.* Orat. 2.

primary Right and peculiar Excellency, above all others, ſince earthly Perſons change their Character, being one while Sons, other while Fathers and Sons, other while Fathers only, and other while neither. The Perſonal Diſtinctives of the Holy Spirit are taken from his connatural Operations and Offices, which are Perſonal, and the Titles therefore appoſite. Now that the eſſential Reaſon and Spirit of God the Father, ſhould each be as equally Perſonal, as the *Socinians* themſelves confeſs the Father to be, will hence appear rational, for that they are conſubſtantial with him, and as ſubſtantially Divine as that Eternal Mind, from, and in which they are, and live, without any inequality in their Nature, Perfection, or eſſential Dignity. And therefore, if one be diſtinctly Perſonal, ſo muſt the others alſo. And therefore the Pronoun *He*, firſt belonging to God original, *i. e.* the Father, as the firſt Perſon, is properly alſo communicable to the other Perſons, each of them deriving their Deity and Perſonal ſubſiſtence from him, with peculiar reaſons of their proper Perſonal Characters and Diſtinctions. And hence it was neceſſary to a juſt perfection of Chriſtian Theology, that our Scriptures, Faith, and Tradition ſhould Characterize

racterize the ſecond and third Hypoſtaſis as perſonally as the firſt, for otherwiſe a Perſonal Diſtinction and Notion of one, and Imperſonal Diſtinctions of the others, or either of them, muſt have ſet them as unequal, ſpecifically different, and heterogeneous in the ſame Deity, and conſequently not conſubſtantial or co-eſſential; for that the Imperſonals muſt have been in nature inferiour to the Perſonal; which would make a moſt corrupt mixture, a moſt præ-rupt and monſtrous anomaly in the Godhead.

§. 35. But perhaps ſome Men, with whom no diverſities are taken for true, but the ſeparate, groſs, and material, may cenſure this Diverſity between the Eternal Mind, Reaſon, and Holy Spirit of Love, ſo then, notional, and imaginary, that it cannot ſuſtain, or ground any Characters perſonally diſtinctive, without a very violent and abuſive impropriety. Now if my Lord, or any other be in this prejudice, let them note that there is a certain true Diverſity between them, and ſuch as we can ſomewhat conceive from the Shade we have of it in our own Souls; Whence a ſedate Theory will conclude, that the true and proper Modes of this their diſtinct ſubſiſtence in the Unity of the Godhead are in

themſelves moſt perfect, and clear, and as Illuſtrious as the Individual Glory of the Divine Eſſence, which one day it will be our Heaven and Happineſs more immediately to view in the fulneſs of indiſtant Light, if at preſent we will be content to learn our Theories from God's Tradition, and not preclude our ſelves from that bleſſed capacity, by a wanton and affected infidelity; for to this glorious intuition this Faith prepares us, by cleanſing us from Heathen *Phænomena* of Providence, and drawing us to the nobler Theories of the Creation, and the Powers of its Author, and exciting us to an active hope and purſuit of that Glory and Happineſs that conſiſts in the uninterrupted Viſion of God. In the mean time however it is rational to believe, that there is a far greater reaſon in that diverſity of their Individual conſubſiſtence, upon which Perſonal Attributes, Characters, Predicates, and Diſtinctives are by the Rules of our Faith given unto them, than any humane faculties can reach, tho' in theſe upon Divine Revelation, there is Light enough to ſupport the congruity of this Tradition againſt all oppoſite Hereſies whatſoever.

§. 36. But the Scoffers will be apt to deride this Theory, as aiming to render the Faith

Faith intelligible, which as they think impoſſible, becauſe their prejudices have ſo fatally blinded them, that they fanſy no Man can diſcern what they cannot, ſo will they ſay, that theſe Theories take away the Myſtery, and conſequently expoſe the venerableneſs thereof to contempt, whereas it hath been our common Wiſdom to cover our Abſurdities with a ſuperſtitious veil and pretence of unfathomable Myſtery. Now what ſhall we do? how ſhall we behave our ſelves between theſe contrary extremes? To the Anti-Myſteriſts therefore, I reply, That if it be hereby made intelligible, they have no reaſon to quarrel at it, ſince their only complaint for their infidelity is, that it is unintelligible. But to the Crypto-Myſteriſts (who give occaſion to the Anti-Myſteriſts to deride us for abſurdities, &c.) I ſhall only need to ſay with

* St. *Athanaſius*, *The Faith is no Riddle*, (*to be kept in the dark*) *but a Divine Myſtery* (to illuminate our Souls.) *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* This was not given from Heaven to ſtupifie and amuſe, but to ſublimate our Theories of God, and to exerciſe our inner Senſes unto previous *Idea's* of that Divinity, which

* Con. *Arian.* Orat. 2. ἐκ δὲν αἰνίγμα, ἀλλὰ μυσήριον θεῖον, &c.

will be more immediately opened unto in the State of Glory. St. *Paul* thought it a noble Wisdom to understand Mysteries, 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. to which all the Sons of Wisdom (though to others there is an ἑκὰς ἐστὶ βέβηλοι) are initiated. Let it therefore be deep and recondite, while it is rich and noble; the treasure is the better for its difficulty, and what is to be gotten is with joy to be communicated to such as have Ears to hear. Tell but a Man that there are three in one, and one in three, without any other Theories, how dry and infant must that Notion be? How little life and taste is there in such a Rudiment? But when a Man is brought by heavenly Theories of the *Logos* to have some apprehensions of the super-essential Excellency of the Father, and almost to feel the vital Love of the Holy Spirit, to view hereby the Originals of the Creation, and the Schemes of Providence in the Ray of Light Essential, in the Archetypal Tables of the Almighty Mind, this is Transport, this is Æther, this is Heaven it self, to which we are wafted up by these depreciated Senses of the Fathers. Yet whatsoever flight a religious Mind may take in these contemplations, God knows these advances of mine are very short, and I have no more to advise an aspi-

aſpiring Piety, but to drink of theſe living Waters from their firſt Fountains, the Holy Scriptures, and the Fathers. But he that thinks it no Myſtery or valuable Theory, that the firſt Principle of all is an eternal glorious lucid Mind, out of whoſe fœcundity there coeſſentially ſtreams a luminous and infinite ſubſtantial Reaſon, with a benign and adorable Spirit of Subſtantial Love and Holineſs, the noble Springs and Fountains of the whole Creation, and the World to come, forgets the thick darkneſs of the old Heathen, and even of the preſent untutour'd World in theſe *Idea's* and Informations; he forgets the ſhortneſs of the moſt ſublimate Theories in proportion to the full Glory of the Myſtery; he forgets how much the Wiſe of the Heathen admired ſome few glances of it among the *Jews*, and are themſelves valued for them, even by our Fathers and our Moderns alſo; he conceives not how divine and ſurprizing this Light appeared to the World upon the firſt opening of Chriſtianity, how it clears up the deluſions of Gentiliſm, and ſpiritualizes our *Idea's* of God above all mixtures of carnality, and prepares them for a glorious intuition of him hereafter; and laſtly ſuch Men loath Manna and the Food of Angels, forgetting their firſt weak-

neſſes, and the difficulties they ſtruggled with before they attained to this Theology; neither do they humbly reflect on their preſent narrowneſs in reſpect of what yet remains within the Veil, or elſe they could never have fallen into contempt of this Revelation as light and void of depth and myſtery.

§. 37. Now leſt any Man from hence ſhould frame an Objection, that upon this Theory we may frame as many Perſons in the Deity, as there are Attributes of God, let it be obſerved, that all the received Attributes of God do denote one, or more, or all of theſe three *Principles, and ſo are not really diſtinct from them, or ſimply deſcribe the whole Divine Eſſence, and ſo no ſingle one of theſe Principles, or elſe are merely negative, and ſo ſignifie no poſitive Principle, or Hypoſtaſis in the Deity, or elſe are extrinſecal, and relative only to exteriour productions, and ſo touch nothing Eternal or Ineſſential to the Divine Nature, that I mention

*This word in our tongue, I ſuppoſe, may not offend, as being ſomewhat turned from what ἀρχὴ and Principium commonly denote. And I call them ſo only in reſpect of the creatures, not abſolutely in reſpect of their own ſubſiſtence, as if they were three unprincipiated Principles; for ſo there is but one, viz. God the Father. So I agree with the Doctrine of the Fathers, as they deny

tion

tion not how, that Eternal Generation and Proceſſion can be conceived of no Attributes diſtinct from the Trinity, the Father, *Logos*, and Holy Spirit. There is therefore in the Deity no poſitive diſtinct intelligible Power, Virtue, or Principle, but Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Mind, Reaſon, and the Holy Spirit of Love, by the Revelation of whoſe Nature, Subſiſtence, Perſonality, Counſels, and Operations the Chriſtian Theology and Religion is moſt pure, defecate, ſublime, full, and abſolute, as became the laſt revelations by the Son of God, but had not been ſo, had it wanted any of theſe received Articles and Theories concerning the adorable and ever bleſſed Trinity.

three Principles non-principiate, for otherwiſe three ſuch Principles would be three Gods.

§. 38. But whereas there are, who profeſſing the Catholick Faith themſelves, would yet open the Church Doors to contrary Opinions, by making the Goſpel, Fathers, and Religious Councils naked unto ſhame, and contriving to abrogate the Sanctions of our Faith, I pathetically beg them to conſider deeply what I have ſaid hereupon, eſpecially in the four laſt Sections, and further remark, that ſince by the Grace of the Holy Spirit, and the Mediation of the Son,

Son, we have an acceſs unto union with God the Father, the firſt Parent and Principle of all, that dwells in Light otherwiſe altogether inacceſſible, it was neceſſary that our Rule of Faith (if juſtly perfect) ſhould ſhew us the way of this aſcent, and particularly what that *Logos*, and Holy Spirit properly and eſſentially are, by whom we ariſe into this Communion with the Father. Elſe ſuch a defect had remained in theſe neceſſary Notices, as had rendred our Faith and Theology blind and uncertain to the inevitable danger of a fundamental Impiety. For Men, hearing of the Son and Holy Spirit, muſt have been curious for a Notion of them, and muſt have taken them for create, or uncreate. Now if being uncreate Men had taken them for created, (as we ſee many will againſt expreſs Revelation, and univerſal Tradition to the contrary) Men would have profaned them and their Deity, the fault whereof had been imputable to God, had he not yielded us the neceſſary Revelation of their Order and Godhead. And ſo likewiſe had they been created, God would not have left us without ſufficient notice thereof, leſt we miſtaking ſhould have adored them for Divine, as the whole Church hath done, and does. But certainly he could not ſo much,

much, ſo fully, ſo often, ſo perpetually have aſſerted their Godhead, and Perſonality, had they been merely created, or impersonal. To have revealed nothing of them had been to have ſhewed no way to Communion and Knowledge of God the Father, and to have ſaid ſomewhat of them, but not enough to fix a Faith and Notion of their Eſſence and Character, had been a Snare. But ſince what is now taught, is both neceſſary and perfect, I think it a damnable Sin not to keep ſuch a Divine *Depoſitum* perfect, whole, and undefiled as it was delivered unto us, but by falſe indulgences of Latitude to betray it up to profanation, corruption, contempt, and infidelity.

§. 39. And here having made a ſufficient Apology for thoſe Theories of the Fathers againſt his Lordſhip's charge of Novelty and Humane Fancy, I could heartily have begg'd a *Nunc Dimittis*, and have ended in theſe pleaſing Contemplations. But our Life is a Warfare, and his Lordſhip's further proceſs requires my further attendance. *But many* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *have thought, that the Term Son did not at all belong to the* * *bleſſed Three, but only to our Saviour, as he was the Meſſias, the* Jews

* *He means to any one of them.*

having

having had this Notion of the Meſſias, that as he was to be the King of Iſrael, *ſo he was to be the Son of God. We find* Nathanael *addreſſed himſelf thus to him, and when the High Prieſt adjured our Saviour, he knits theſe two together, art thou the Chriſt the Son of the moſt High God? Which ſhews that they did eſteem thoſe two as one and the ſame thing.* This account of the *Jews* notion his Lordſhip ſeems to have taken out of Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotation on *Pſal.* 2. v. 7. Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. For theſe are that great and good Doctor's words; ——*the learned* Jews *themſelves reſolved, that he was to be the Son of God, and that in an eminent manner; (So the High Prieſt,* Matth. 26. 63. *Tell us, whether thou art the Chriſt the Son of God,* and Joh. 1. 49. *Rabbi thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael,*) &c. Which Text therefore the Doctor prophetically interprets of his reſurrection and exaltation according to good New Teſtament Authorities. But he that ſaid this, never taught his Lordſhip that the term Son did not at all belong to any of the bleſſed Three, but expreſly in the ſame Annotation proves from *Rom.* 1. 4. that he was declared to be the Eternal Son of God (the ſecond of the bleſſed three) by his Reſurrection

rection from the dead. And it is not fair play in his Lordſhip to cite a place and conceal the Author, that ſo God's truth, and his doubling might not be diſcerned. But ſince we are upon a critical diſquiſition of theſe terms, *Meſſias* and Son of God, we will conſider firſt what the real truth is; and ſecondly the opinion of the *Jews*. Firſt then it is certain, that God's conſtitution of any Perſon in a State of favour gives the favourite the Title of a Son by virtue thereof. Thus God calls the People of *Iſrael* his Son, and his Firſt Born, *Exod.* 4. 22. and ſo literally; *Hoſea* 11. 1. and many other places ſet God as their Father, becauſe God had admitted them as the ſeed of *Abraham* into his eſpecial Covenant, as we are alſo Sons of God by the adoption of the New Covenant. And hence exaltation by God to an high Authority has founded a title of Gods, and Sons of God, unto Men, and Angels. And conſequently the various ſignal Exaltations of Chriſt in his Humane Nature, above all others make him in thoſe reſpects juſtly to be ſtyled the Son of God. If then he had been only exalted into the heavenly Throne, without any antecedent Death or Reſurrection, this alone would have founded a Filial Title, much more when

when in Order thereto, he was born again out of a Virgin Sepulcher, whereby he became the first Born, or first Begotten from the Dead. So his Transfiguration on Mount *Tabor*, and his Unction by the Holy Ghost at his Baptism (in both which the *Bath-Col*, the voice from Heaven pronounced him God's beloved Son) were fair grounds for the same Character. His Conception by the Holy Ghost in the Virgin's Womb was a foundation thereof * before all these, though not the primary. By the † Son God made the Worlds, and thereby the Son became Heir of all things. And hereupon it was by many Ancients preached as Good Theology, that herein also he was the Son of God, and the * first Born and Heir of the whole Creation, they setting it off as a kind of Nativity and Production of the *Logos* into Light and the World. And those many Texts of Scripture, besides the Catholick Tradition of Creeds, that teach him to be in the form of God, and equal with God, the true God, God above all blessed

* *Luk.* 1. 35. πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε, &c. διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ. *where* καὶ *shews that this was not the first ground of his Filiation.*

† *Heb.* 1. 2.

* *Col.* 1. 15. πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.

bleſſed for ever, and that he hath received his being from the Father, have eſtabliſhed the Faith of an Eternal Paternity and Coeternal Filiation. So that if we take the Humane Nature into the Conception and Character of the Chriſt as his Lordſhip does, here are ſeveral grounds for the Character of Son, before our Lord actually was a Man, or could be on his Lordſhips Notions the *Meſſias*. And ſo Son of God and *Meſſias* cannot really in the true intention of the Scriptures be altogether ſynonymous, equæval, or equipollent, though belonging to the ſame Perſon. Now if *Nathanael* made a good and full Confeſſion, when he told our Lord, *Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of *Iſrael*, then he owned all the truth of the Filial Character; but if his Faith were defective, then it is no ground for his Lordſhip's Criticks to ſtay ſo low in it, and not advance to the Higheſt revealed Excellency of the Character, which I believe the true *Iſraelite* reached as well as † St. *Peter* and others, ſince the Goſpels ſet this for a good memorial of their and the Catholick Faith. But however, let us ſee what the Faith of the

* *John* 1. 50.

† *Matth.* 16. 16. *Joh.* 6. 69.

Jews

Jews contributes to our Edification. By the Teſtimony of the Fathers from after *Joſephus*'s days, it appears an eſtabliſhed or received Doctrine among the *Jews*, as alſo other Hereticks herein ſo judaizing, that the *Meſſias* was to be a mere Man, and ſo no wonder if all *Rabbins* ſince, that own him to be the Son of God, take him only for a poſitive or adoptive Son by mere advancement. Now if his Lordſhip thinks this to have been their Faith alſo in our Lord's days, then thoſe ſome Criticks of his Lordſhip's cannot found the Filiation of the *Theanthropus* in this *Jewiſh* Faith. But if theſe *Jews* did believe their expected *Meſſias* to be a real *Immanuel* according to their Prophet, and this *Immanuel* to be the Son of God, how can his Lordſhip's Criticks prove that in the *Immanuel*'s Filiation † the firſt Conception of the Sonſhip was in his Humanity? For if there were another Conception of Sonſhip in the Divine Nature, how can they, or his Lordſhip prove it to be poſterior to that in the Humanity? To be Son of God is a Character at leaſt of Dignity, and if there be any thing in the Deity that bears it, it cannot derive it from any Creature,

* P. 32. *in which the Humane Nature being the firſt Conception?*

ture, and ſo in order of Conception it ought not to be poſterior to the Title in a Creature. His Lordſhip had beſt have a care, leſt he and his Critick's * call in upon *Marcellus* in this rode of Conceptions, and father the Hereſie upon the *Jews*. But if there be no real Son in the Godhead, there will be no Father neither before the Creation, and conſequently the Humane Nature being originally filiate, being united to God (who by the Creation thereof only is its Father, *i. e.* natural Parent) will convey the Title of Son to its own Father by this Union, which ſince it can be only a nominal diſpenſation, here comes in a beloved *Sabellianiſm*. But if there be a Sonſhip in the Godhead, ſince it cannot be derivative, it muſt be Primitive to the Character given to the united Humanity, becauſe of that Union, and if ſo, how can its Conception be firſt lodged in the Humanity, to which it is ſocially communicated in the entire *Suppoſitum* of the *Theanthropus*, but not ſingly diſtributed by any dividing Conception, except we will put up with *Neſtorius*. But to look a little further into this matter; I think it manifeſt, that the *Jews* believed the Son

* Vid. *Euſeb.* con. *Marcell.*

of God to be a Perſon not Humane, but equal to the Father, and ſo had no firſt Conceptions of it in Humane Nature. The Perſonal Title of Son, with others, that *Philo* gives the *Logos*, which he did not believe to have been incarnate, is a full proof of this firſt point, that he was called Son by the *Jews* without any reſpects to Humanity, ſince he taught this as the Theology of *Moſes*, and the Tradition of the Elders; and that this Filial *Logos* was by them believed equal to God the Father.

* *Joh.* ch. 5. 17. &c. vid. ch. 10.

* St. *John* proves, for that the *Jews* would have killed *Jeſus*, for ſaying that God was his Father, making himſelf thereby equal with God, and ſo God; which our Saviour refuſes not, but defends. And even *Joſephus* after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* owning our *Jeſus* to be Chriſt, doubts whether it were lawful to call him a Man, becauſe the old Notion, that God was, and was to be the King of *Iſrael*, was not yet worn out. They looked on the Kingdom of the *Meſſias* as the Kingdom of God, and they looked for the Son of God (whom *Agur* of old knew under that Character) to come, and ſet up his Reign among them, and to ſubdue all Nations there-

thereunto. And therefore St. *John* ſhews him, and the Devils confeſs him the Son of God alſo as well as his Diſciples; nay, the Centurion at his Crucifixion owned him to be the Son of God, who never ſaw him to have been, nor ever hoped to ſee him hereafter to be the King of the *Jews*, according to their Notions of his Royalty. For though they looked on their King to come to be God, the Son of the Father, yet they took his Kingdom to be ſecular. And he that conſiders, that in the Goſpels the terms of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are ſpoken of to, and by the *Jews* familiarly, without any of our Lord's correction of the *Jewiſh* Notion, or Inſtitution of any other, either in common among the multitudes, or privately among his Diſciples, muſt reſolve that the true notion of theſe three Perſons was popular, and received by an indubitate and good Tradition, or elſe our Lord and his Apoſtles, having a recondite Notion of them unexplained, could not be underſtood by that People. Nor could *Nathanael* and *Peter* and others have made a right confeſſion of Faith, without any preliminary Catechiſm of the Notion, had it not been general? And in vain had God the Father at his

Baptiſm declared him to be his Son, in whom he was well pleaſed to all the multitude, had they been Strangers to the true ſenſe of the Title, which imported not only a Royalty, but an * omnipotent Divine Power, even, had he pleaſed, of turning Stones into Bread by his mere Commandment, † and to torment even Devils before their time; and alſo a Divine Knowledge of the Father, for no Man knoweth the Father but the Son, who being the * Holy One of God, was therefore the Holy One of *Iſrael*. And though it may be objected, that when the *Jews* demanded him, to come down from the Croſs, if he would be believed, 'tis ſaid by the Evangeliſts, If he be the Chriſt, the King of *Iſrael*, let him come down from the Croſs; yet this ſuppoſes, that, had he this Power, he muſt have it as God the Chriſt and King, and not as a Man only anointed King of *Iſrael*. So that neither the true, nor falſe Conceptions of the *Jews* concerning his Filial Character, can help his Lordſhip and his Criticks in their firſt Conceptions of it in his Humanity. And here,

* *Matth.* 4. *Mar.* 1. *Luke* 4.

† *Matth.* 8. 29. *Mar.* 5. 7. *Luke* 8. 28.

* *Luke* 4. 34.

here, indeed, there lies a large and noble Field before me for a Theory, concerning the Titles of Chriſt, Lord, King of *Iſrael*, &c. on what grounds they ſtand in the Divine and Humane Nature, wherein might be ſhewn that neither are the firſt Conceptions of all theſe in our Lord's Humanity, to the utter ruin of Criticiſm; but it being not here neceſſary, and withal being a matter of a large ſpeculation, I wave it in this place; and the rather, becauſe, if my unhappy Eyes will hold out ſo far to ſerve my deſigns, I intend a peculiar Treatiſe concerning the Kingdom of God, in which theſe Titular Characters of our Lord will be largely diſcuſſed. In the mean time, I am ſorry his Lordſhip's Criticks are ſpoiled in their kind aims to explain the Texts, that teach the inferiority of Chriſt as Man to the Father; but I am pretty well pleaſed however, that the Catholick Doctrine has no need of ſuch new faſhioned planes to ſmooth its difficulties.

§. 40. But now at laſt the Scene opens, and the whole myſterious intrigue comes out, why all this pother is made. For ſaith my Lord, * *If this be true, all the Speculations concerning an Eternal Generation are cut off in the ſtrict* * P. 32.

ſenſe of the words, though in a larger ſenſe every Emanation, of what ſort ſoever, may be ſo called. But was it my Lord's part to leave this in ſuſpenſe, whether it be true or no? To leave hereby a liberty to deny the *Nicene* Faith, that he was begotten of his Father before all Worlds? Would not common honeſty oblige a Divinity Profeſſor to determine one way or other, between the inconſiſtent Fathers, and theſe ſagacious Criticks, either for, or againſt an Eternal Generation? and yet to let us ſee which way he inclines, he brings Texts of Scripture perverted for the ſenſe of Hereticks, but not one ſacred ſyllable for the Fathers; nothing but faſtidious and expoſing Cenſures. Yet this was not enough. The diſtinct Emanations of the Son, and the Holy Spirit were to be confounded, though one be from the Father only, and immediately, the other from the Father and the Son, as we Weſterns confeſs; or, to ſpeak more like the *Greeks*, from the Father by the Son; that ſo the Emanation of the Holy Spirit being in a larger ſenſe called Generation, the Holy Spirit may in a larger ſenſe be called the Son of God: And ſo God the Father ſhall have improperly two Sons, but really none

none at all till the being of Christ's Humanity.

§. 41. And now for a blessed *Epiphonema*. * *But it may be justly questioned, whether by these they have made it better to be understood, or more firmly believed, or whether others have not taken advantage to represent these subtilties as Dregs, either of* Æones, *of the* Valentinians, *or of* the Platonick Notions. —— *And it being long before these Theories were well stated and settled, it is no wonder if many of the Fathers have not only differed from one another, but even from themselves in speaking upon this Argument. When Men go about to explain a thing, of which they can have no distinct* Idea, *it is very natural for them to run out into a vast multiplicity of words; into great length, and much darkness and confusion. Many* † *impertinent Similes will be urged, and often impertinent reasonings will be made use of, all which are the unavoidable consequences of a Man's going about to explain to others, what he does not distinctly understand himself.* Now to this calumnious reflexion it were enough to say, the Lord rebuke thee; but for the sake of others,

* P. 32.

† *Witness* P. 41, 42. &c.

ſenſe of the words, though in a larger ſenſe every Emanation, of what ſort ſoever, may be ſo called. But was it my Lord's part to leave this in ſuſpenſe, whether it be true or no? To leave hereby a liberty to deny the *Nicene* Faith, that he was begotten of his Father before all Worlds? Would not common honeſty oblige a Divinity Profeſſor to determine one way or other, between the inconſiſtent Fathers, and theſe ſagacious Criticks, either for, or againſt an Eternal Generation? and yet to let us ſee which way he inclines, he brings Texts of Scripture perverted for the ſenſe of Hereticks, but not one ſacred ſyllable for the Fathers; nothing but faſtidious and expoſing Cenſures. Yet this was not enough. The diſtinct Emanations of the Son, and the Holy Spirit were to be confounded, though one be from the Father only, and immediately, the other from the Father and the Son, as we Weſterns confeſs; or, to ſpeak more like the *Greeks*, from the Father by the Son; that ſo the Emanation of the Holy Spirit being in a larger ſenſe called Generation, the Holy Spirit may in a larger ſenſe be called the Son of God: And ſo God the Father ſhall have improperly two Sons, but really none

none at all till the being of Chriſt's Humanity.

§. 41. And now for a bleſſed *Epiphonema*. * *But it may be juſtly queſtioned, whether by theſe they have made it better to be underſtood, or more firmly believed, or whether others have not taken advantage to repreſent theſe ſubtilties as Dregs, either of* Æones, *of the* Valentinians, *or of* the Platonick Notions. —— *And it being long before theſe Theories were well ſtated and ſettled, it is no wonder if many of the Fathers have not only differed from one another, but even from themſelves in ſpeaking upon this Argument. When Men go about to explain a thing, of which they can have no diſtinct* Idea, *it is very natural for them to run out into a vaſt multiplicity of words; into great length, and much darkneſs and confuſion. Many* † *impertinent Similes will be urged, and often impertinent reaſonings will be made uſe of, all which are the unavoidable conſequences of a Man's going about to explain to others, what he does not diſtinctly underſtand himſelf.* Now to this calumnious reflexion it were enough to ſay, the Lord rebuke thee; but for the ſake of others,

* P. 32.

† *Witneſs* P. 41, 42. &c.

that may either glory in it, or be beguiled by it, I will anſwer it in order. Firſt then all theſe traduced Theories of Faith are univerſally profeſſed, and received in the whole Church of God, and have but a very few Adverſaries: And we have reaſon to attribute this univerſal Conſent herein to the Piety and Labours of the Ancients, who ſo victoriouſly defended it againſt the Higheſt Parts, Principalities, and Powers. For whatſoever failures and leſſer miſtakes (from which no mortal is, or can be ſecure) may ſometimes appear in a courſe of nice Diſputations, yet the main Body of them appeared ſo ſtrong and convincing, that they bowed down the whole World into Conviction: I mean the Chriſtian World; while the Adverſaries thereof have deſervedly attained the glory of preparing the way for *Mahometiſm*. What matter then is it if theſe Divine Theories (which his Lordſhip opprobriouſly calls ſubtilties) be abuſively repreſented by wicked Men? Does it follow that the Theology is vicious, and to be quitted? Such Counſel as this would ſoon have ſtrangled the whole Chriſtianity, which at firſt was every where traduced. What they, if that Impoſtor *Sandius* * would

* *Enucl. Hiſt.* Eccl. l. 1.

would derive our Faith from *Valentinus*? The vulgar Chriſtians do not know, nor trouble themſelves with thoſe fabulous *Æons*, nor is there any danger of frighting them from the Faith by this imputation. And as for the Learned, or Students in Antiquity, they will ſoon diſcover the falſhood, and even to ſave, or facilitate their labour, 'tis unanſwerably † done to their hands already, by an Author his Lordſhip will never be able to anſwer. But this Calumny is as ſilly as it is falſe and debaſing. For *Irenæus* the great mawl of *Valentinianiſm*, defends our very Faith and Theology againſt that and all other Gnoſtick Hereſies. Nay, and St. *John* one would think was a Preacher of our Doctrine. And can any one be brought to believe, that St. *John* and St. *Irenæus* were tainted or drunk with the Lees of *Æoniſm*? Let *Sandius* therefore and his Lordſhip make what advantages they pleaſe againſt our Theories by their *Valentinian* Character; there is no great danger: The Lion's Hide covers a very tractable Animal. For after all *Sandius* his Diſguiſes, his Father *Arius*, his *Thalea* (which he ſwaggered as deſcending from Men ἀγελάστων,

† *Bull.* Defenſ. Fid. *Nicen.* p. 64, 65. & alib. Sect. 3. c. 1.

Deodi-

θεοδιδάκτων, κατὰ πάντα σοφῶν τε) had its ἐκ τῆς πρὶν γεννηθῇ from Grandsire *Valentine*, and his *Symmystæ*. Well, to go along with his Lordship, how came the poor old doating Fathers to nod thus? His Lordship tells us, 'twas because 'twas long before these Theories were well stated and settled. And here I had been at a sad loss for an *Epocha* of this settlement, if I had not by good fortune met with Dr. *Burnet*'s Letter of Remarks upon the two strong Box Papers, where he tells us thus: *It seems plain, that the Fathers before the Council of* Nice *believed the Divinity of the Son of God to be in some sort inferiour to that of the Father, and for some Ages after the Council of* Nice *they believed them indeed both equal, but they considered these as two different beings, and only one in Essence, as three Men have the same Humane Nature in common among them, and that as one Candle lights another, so one flowed from another; and after the fifth Century the Doctrine of one Individual Essence was received. If you will be further informed concerning this, Father* Petau *will satisfie you as to the first Period before the Council of* Nice, *and the Learned Dr.* Cudworth *as to the second.* So then the Primitive Faith till the *Nicene* Council

Council was, That there were two Divinities or Deities, one of the Father, and another of the Son, and that of the Son somewhat inferiour to that of the Father. From the Council of *Nice* to the ſixth Century, they believed two or three different * Beings, and theſe equal, and no otherwiſe of one Eſſence than three Men that are of one common Nature. But in the beginning of the ſixth Century, then their Eyes and Faith opened into one individual Eſſence; and then I ſuppoſe the matter was ſettled. Be this ſo for once; what will it amount to? That all the Fathers till the ſixth Century were Polytheiſts and Idolaters, not excepting the *Nicene*. When a Man thinks upon this he muſt needs confeſs it not † only perhaps, but for certain invidious to ſend Men to the Jeſuit for a Calumny againſt the Primitives, and were ſo to Dr. *Cudworth* to make his Hiſtory of ſuch Conſequence. But as for *Petavius* and his Admirers, I think them all refuted by Dr. *Bull* beyond all poſſibility of

* *What is this but* οὐσίας, *eſſences, or* ὑποστάσεις?

† *Diſcourſ.* 3. p. 65. *It were perhaps too invidious to ſend Men to* Petavius *to find in him how much the Tradition of the ſeveral Ages has varied in the greateſt Articles of the Chriſtian Faith.*

of a reply; and as for the Arguments upon a Specifick Homoousion cited by Dr. *Cudworth* and others, I have above accounted for their innocency, §. 11. and proved, that though they argued from a ſpecifick Homoouſion through the *Arian* Cavils, (eſpecially to avoid the Charge of *Sabellianiſm*) yet they did not aſſert this alone, as his Lordſhip charges them. But now to come upon my Lord's blind ſide: In his Letter he ſays, the Poſt-*Nicene* Fathers were for an equality, and uſed for their Theory the Simile of Candles. In the Diſcourſe we are upon he ſays, the Simile of Candles gave riſe to the *Nicene* form Light of Light, and therefore muſt be uſed by the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, whom he aſſerts to be for an inequality. In his Letter the ſpecifick Homoouſiaſts are equalizers; but in his Diſcourſe the ſame are Subordinators. But here again I would fain ſee the Simile of Candles produced among the *Poſt-Nicene* Homoouſiaſts, to whom in his Letter my Lord aſſigns it. Again in his Diſcourſe the Theory of the Divine Wiſdom and Love is ſaid to be conſequent or concomitant to the Doctrine of one individual Eſſence. In the Letter this Doctrine commences with the ſixth Century. But

all

all the Fathers that I have above-cited for the Theory of the Wiſdom and Love of the Divine Mind, eſpecially §. 21. §. 23. lived long before his Lordſhip's *Epocha*, even in the fourth Century the very loweſt, and lateſt. But ſince his Lordſhip is become a Father, no wonder if he falls into contradictions too againſt himſelf and truth too; for it ſeems 'tis of ancient preſcription with Men of that Character. But in ſhort, I thought all theſe traduced Theories to have been ever ſettled, and that ſettlement not begun, but continued and defended only by the Councils and Fathers in ſeveral Ages, according as ſeemed then moſt ſeaſonable in reſpect of the Hereſies, and Sentiments then fermenting; which occaſions a ſeeming variety in forms of expreſſion, but no real difference in the Subſtance of their Faith, that ſo Men herein might charge them with mutual or ſelf-contradictions. And yet that which we ſtand for is not every notion of every Father, but what they all agree in, and ſuch are thoſe Theories which his Lordſhip hath expoſed as Exorbitant: Let his Lordſhip prove their expreſs contradictions each to other in theſe eſtabliſhed and received Theories, and then indeed he may more creditably

expoſe

of a reply; and as for the Arguments upon a Specifick Homoousion cited by Dr. *Cudworth* and others, I have above accounted for their innocency, §. 11. and proved, that though they argued from a ſpecifick Homoouſion through the *Arian* Cavils, (eſpecially to avoid the Charge of *Sabellianiſm*) yet they did not aſſert this alone, as his Lordſhip charges them. But now to come upon my Lord's blind ſide: In his Letter he ſays, the Poſt-*Nicene* Fathers were for an equality, and uſed for their Theory the Simile of Candles. In the Diſcourſe we are upon he ſays, the Simile of Candles gave riſe to the *Nicene* form Light of Light, and therefore muſt be uſed by the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, whom he aſſerts to be for an inequality. In his Letter the ſpecifick Homoouſiaſts are equalizers; but in his Diſcourſe the ſame are Subordinators. But here again I would fain ſee the Simile of Candles produced among the *Poſt-Nicene* Homoouſiaſts, to whom in his Letter my Lord aſſigns it. Again in his Diſcourſe the Theory of the Divine Wiſdom and Love is ſaid to be conſequent or concomitant to the Doctrine of one individual Eſſence. In the Letter this Doctrine commences with the ſixth Century. But

all

all the Fathers that I have above-cited for the Theory of the Wiſdom and Love of the Divine Mind, eſpecially §. 21. §. 23. lived long before his Lordſhip's *Epocha*, even in the fourth Century the very loweſt, and lateſt. But ſince his Lordſhip is become a Father, no wonder if he falls into contradictions too againſt himſelf and truth too; for it ſeems 'tis of ancient preſcription with Men of that Character. But in ſhort, I thought all theſe traduced Theories to have been ever ſettled, and that ſettlement not begun, but continued and defended only by the Councils and Fathers in ſeveral Ages, according as ſeemed then moſt ſeaſonable in reſpect of the Hereſies, and Sentiments then fermenting; which occaſions a ſeeming variety in forms of expreſſion, but no real difference in the Subſtance of their Faith, that ſo Men herein might charge them with mutual or ſelf-contradictions. And yet that which we ſtand for is not every notion of every Father, but what they all agree in, and ſuch are thoſe Theories which his Lordſhip hath expoſed as Exorbitant: Let his Lordſhip prove their expreſs contradictions each to other in theſe eſtabliſhed and received Theories, and then indeed he may more creditably

expoſe his Father's Nakedneſs, though that practice is but of ill and execrable preſcription. But as his Lordſhip has upbraided the Primitive Tradition of the Faith and the Scriptures in theſe Diſcourſes, and the forementioned Letter, and loaded the Traditors with ſo much reproach; he has done what in him lies to diſcourage Students from reading or regarding them, and not only ſo, but he has put ſuch a Dagger into the hands of Deiſts, and the open Enemies of all Revealed Religion, as he himſelf will never be able to extort; for who will believe the Church, that ſhe received the New Teſtament from Men divinely inſpired, when for Five Hundred Years after Chriſt her Principles were Polytheiſt and Idolatrous, and ſhe knew not the very firſt Rudiments of a true Faith, and when ſhe at laſt did ſo, yet fell into divers ſilly conceits and Similes about it ſince ſcorned and rejected by the Critick Tribe?

§. 42. And now I am reſolved to end, though his Divinity affords much more corrigible matter: At the horrour whereof, I leave him to God's Mercy, and

and the Churches Prayers; but his Writings of this ſtamp, either to his own ingenuous Recantation, or Canonical Cenſure.

F I N I S.